ISRAEL AND EDOM: A STUDY OF THE ANTI-EDOM BIAS IN OLD TESTAMENT RELIGION

by

Bruce Collins Cresson

Department of Religion
Duke University

Date: Sept. 27, 1963

Approved:

W. F. Stinespring
W. F. Stinespring, Supervisor

Orval Wintermute

Kenneth W. Clark

Robert S. Rogers

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in the Department of Religion
in the Graduate School of Arts and
Sciences of Duke University

1963

ABSTRACT

(Biblical Studies)

ISRAEL AND EDOM: A STUDY OF THE ANTI-EDOM BIAS IN OLD TESTAMENT RELIGION

by

Bruce Collins Cresson

Department of Religion
Duke University

Date: Sept. 27, 1963

Approved:

W. F. Stinespring
W. F. Stinespring, Supervisor

Orval Wintermute

Kenneth W. Clark

Robert Rogers

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Religion in the Graduate
School of Arts and Sciences of
Duke University

1963

Tr.R.
Ph.D.
C922I
1964

ABSTRACT

ISRAEL AND EDOM: A STUDY OF THE ANTI-EDOM BIAS IN OLD TESTAMENT RELIGION

by

Bruce Collins Cresson

This dissertation deals with an aspect of the thought of the Old Testament--the bias against Edom. The prominence of the anti-Edom bias sets it apart from the more general anti-foreign feeling. For this fact there must be an explanation. Such explanation is sought by study of this biased feeling as expressed in the Old Testament.

Initially an examination is made of the history of Edom, based primarily upon Biblical and archaeological materials. Since no history of Edom has been published since Buhl's in 1893, much use had to be made of the work, primarily archaeological, of Glueck, Rothenberg, Kirkbride, and others in the area of ancient Edom since 1930. In so far as is possible in the light of present knowledge the relationships between Hebrews and Edomites are pointed out in the course of this historical study. An attitude of hatred between nations does not develop in a historical vacuum. The groundwork thus is laid for discussion of the anti-Edom bias.

The Old Testament passages expressing an anti-Edom bias are examined exegetically, but with no intention of making an exhaustive exegetical study. The primary concern is to analyze the bias against Edom in its varying expressions. The anti-Edom passages are, wherever possible, related to one another.

Chapter III is devoted to an analysis of the series of three articles by Julian Morgenstern, "Jerusalem--485 B.C.," which were published in the Hebrew Union College Annual. The conclusions of Morgenstern, especially that in 485 B.C. Jerusalem was destroyed by a coalition of neighboring states, including Edom, are rejected as lacking in supporting evidence.

This study points out the fragmentary knowledge of the history of Edom, as well as the lack of serious work on the history of this nation. Especially nebulous is the history of Edom in the century before and the two centuries after 587 B.C. On the basis of fragmentary knowledge of Edom's history and an examination of anti-Edom passages in the Old Testament, the conclusion is reached that the principal roots of this bias are traceable to 587 B.C. and the attitude and actions of the Edomites in this time of distress for Jerusalem and Judah. The question is raised by way of suggestion as to whether or not the Esau-Jacob stories may have been editorially colored in the light of this bias. The thesis is set forth that the anti-Edom bias became, from the standpoint of the Jews, more than a historically based hatred; it became a religious concept, or, "Damn-Edom Theology." The development of this concept is traced from its historical inception to its development as a concept colored with eschatological and apocalyptic overtones, and in a forward glance the use of "Edom" as a symbolical designation of the enemy of the Jews in the post-Biblical period is noticed.

PREFACE

The subject of this study first came to the writer's attention while studying Old Testament Prophecy with Dr. W. F. Stinespring at Duke University. In the course of his lectures it was pointed out that a peculiar attitude of bias toward Edom on the part of the Jews appeared to be characteristic of the post-Exilic Prophets.

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine the bias toward Edom as it appears in the Old Testament religion. It was first necessary to make a rather detailed study of the land of Edom and the history of its people, recognizing that attitudes do not develop in a historical vacuum. It was discovered that Edom has been tragically neglected by historians and excavators (with the exception of the Nabataean city of Petra). The examination of passages in the Old Testament expressing an anti-Edom bias was undertaken with no intent of making an exhaustive exegetical study--such has been done by others--but with the purpose of examining these passages from the particular angle of their anti-Edom bias. Thus it was more important to see how a passage was related to other anti-Edom passages than to other passages in the same book. An examination of Julian Morgenstern's articles on "Jerusalem--485 B.C." was necessary, because if one could accept his conclusions the anti-Edom passages in the Old Testament would have to be related to a different historical situation from that usually assigned them.

This study has been interesting and rewarding. Perhaps nothing of striking newness has been discovered and set forth, but lines have been drawn for investigation on the part of the writer for years to come.

The writer expresses gratitude to his major professor, William F. Stinespring, whose helpful suggestions and patient guidance have contributed much to this study. Appreciation is expressed also to Professor John Strugnell, who served as director of this study during the Spring of 1963. The author is also indebted to others who have made valuable suggestions concerning form and content: Dr. Orval Wintermute, Dr. James M. Efird, Dr. Marc H. Lovelace, and Mrs. Esther C. Hoyle. Appreciation is also expressed to the typist, Mrs. Jacob Kaplan. Acknowledgment of and appreciation for financial assistance are expressed to Duke University for a graduate scholarship for 1960-61 and to the Rockefeller Foundation for a Rockefeller Doctoral Fellowship for 1961-62. There are other debts of gratitude, too many to be recorded; but special notice of appreciation must be made for assistance by the staffs of Duke University Library and the Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary Library. Finally appreciation is expressed to the writer's wife, Joanne S. Cresson, for her patience, encouragement, and assistance--indeed a _sine qua non_ for this project.

B. C. C.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

PREFACE v

ABBREVIATIONS. ix

I. INTRODUCTION: A SURVEY OF THE HISTORY OF EDOM. 2

- The Land of Seir, 2
- Pre-Edomite Seir, 13
- The Kingdom of Edom: Establishment and Early History, 25
- The Kingdom of Edom: Its Culture, 28
- The Kingdom of Edom: 1020-587 B.C., 32
- The Idumaeans, 46

II. AN EXAMINATION OF OLD TESTAMENT PASSAGES EXPRESSING AN ANTI-EDOM BIAS 49

- Introduction, 49
- The Book of Obadiah, 51
  - Authorship, 51
  - Position in the Canon, 52
  - Unity and Date, 53
  - Content, 64
  - Translation, 64
  - Commentary and Interpretation, 66
- Jeremiah 49:7-22, 72
- Ezekiel 25:12-14 and 35:1-15, 80
- Lamentations 4:21, 22, 84
- Joel 4:19, 85
- Amos 1:11, 12, 88
- Malachi 1:2-5, 89
- Isaiah 21:11, 12, 90
- Isaiah 63:1-6, 95
- Psalm 137, 96
- Conclusion, 98

III. JERUSALEM--485 B.C.? 100

- Introduction, 100
- Psalm 48, 102
- Nehemiah, 112
- Lamentations, 113

III. [continued]

Ezekiel, 116
Obadiah and Malachi, 117
Psalms, 118
Isaiah 63:15-64:12, 125
Joel 3:2b,3-8, 19, 20, 126
Nehemiah 5:8 and Isaiah 60:4, 8-22, 127
The Historic Setting of the Catastrophe, 128
The Judaean King, 131
Antecedents of the Catastrophe, 134
Conclusions, 137

IV. CONCLUSIONS 141

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. 153

ADDENDUM: A LISTING OF WORKS BY JULIAN MORGENSTERN 178

ABBREVIATIONS

AASOR = *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*

ANET = *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, edited by Pritchard

AJSL = *American Journal of Semitic Languages*

ATD = "Das Alte Testament Deutsch"

BA = *Biblical Archaeologist*

BASOR = *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*

BDB = Brown, Driver, Briggs, *Hebrew Lexicon*

BH^3 = *Biblia Hebraica*, edited by Rudolf Kittel

BJRL = *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*

BZAW = "Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft"

CB = "Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges"

GKC = Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley, *Hebrew Grammar*

HAT = "Handbuch zum Alten Testament"

HUCA = *Hebrew Union College Annual*

IB = "Interpreter's Bible"

ICC = "International Critical Commentary"

JAOS = *Journal of the American Oriental Society*

JBL = *Journal of Biblical Literature*

JNES = *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*

JPOS = *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*

JQR = *Jewish Quarterly Review*

JSS = *Journal of Semitic Studies*

JTS = *Journal of Theological Studies*

LXX = Septuagint

MT = Massoretic Text

PEQ = *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*

RB = *Revue Biblique*

VT = *Vetus Testamentum*

WC = "Westminster Commentaries"

ZAW = *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

ISRAEL AND EDOM: A STUDY OF THE ANTI-EDOM BIAS IN OLD TESTAMENT RELIGION

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION: A SURVEY OF THE HISTORY OF EDOM

The civilization and history of Edom have long ago passed from open view and can be reconstructed only with the aid of artifacts, ancient records, and proper evaluation of these remaining evidences of a nation which ceased to exist over two thousand years ago. The Edomites were not the first people to occupy the territory which, for the sake of convenience, is called Edom, although properly it was Edom for only a few centuries (13th to 6th centuries B.C.).

The Land of Seir[1]

The general location of Edom's territorial possessions is not seriously questioned, but the specific location of its boundaries has been debated for many years. Edom is usually described as lying south of the Dead Sea and Moab, along and generally east of the Wadi Arabah, and north of the peninsula of Sinai, the Gulf of Aqabah, and the Arabian Desert.[2] There is general agreement as to the north, east, and south boundaries of Edom; but the western limitation is uncertain and widely disputed.

---

[1] See *infra*, pp. 14, 15, fn. 4.

[2] George Ernest Wright and Floyd Vivian Filson, *The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible* (Rev. edition, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956), plate v, p. 41.

In the Biblical tradition, in which Edom is identified with Esau,[1] the territory in which Esau and his descendants lived was the "hill country of Seir."[2] The text of the Old Testament describes the territory of Edom-Seir[3] as including the Wadi Arabah and areas both east and west of this depression.[4] Kadesh is said to be on the border of the King of Edom,[5] and the territory of Judah is described as lying "against" the territory of Edom.[6] The territory of Judah is described in Joshua 5:1-12; and especially in verse 1 it is said to reach southward to the boundary of Edom, to the Wilderness of Zin at the farthest south. This desert-like region in the Negeb was considered a part of the territory of Judah, and this desert is described as lying along-

---

1. Genesis 25:30; 36:8.

2. Genesis 36:8, 9; cf. Obadiah 8, 9, 19, 21--"the hill country of Esau."

3. Jan Josef Simons, The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament ("Studia Francisci Scholten Memoria Dicata," edited by A. A. Kampman, vol. II, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959), pp. 8, 401. He points out that Aram (ארם) and Edom (אדם) have been rather frequently confused and interchanged in the text of the Old Testament. Cited as examples are II Samuel 8:12, II Kings 16:6, II Chronicles 20:2, Ezekiel 16:57, and 27:16. In II Samuel 8:13 the reading "Edom" for the MT "Aram" is "critically possible and objectively more probable." In I Kings 11:25b the MT reading is "Aram" while the LXX and Syriac read "Edom." The more intelligible reading in Amos 1:9 would be "Aram" for the very improbable "Edom" of the MT, which reading is suspected of having been influenced by Amos 1:6. I Maccabees 3:41 is another example of interchange where "Syria" must be replaced by "Idumaea." This change, Simons contends, can be traced to within the Hebrew text, where ארם and אדם were erroneously interchanged, or to the work of the translator of the Hebrew text.

4. Wolf W. von Baudissin, "Edom," Realencyklopädia für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche (edited by Johann Jakob Herzog, Bd. V, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1898), pp. 162-170. On p. 164 he has correctly argued that the original land of the Edomites was west of the Wadi Arabah. Genesis 27:39, from which he supports this contention, applies equally well to the territory east of the Wadi Arabah.

5. Numbers 20:16.

6. Numbers 34:3; Joshua 15:1.

side Edom.[1] Thus the Biblical evidence clearly places Edom partially on the western side of the Wadi Arabah. That the most important part of Edom lies to the east of the Wadi Arabah is clear, however, from the Biblical tradition. Simons states the case concisely:

> . . . all the Edomite kings and family chiefs enumerated in Genesis 36:31ff ∽ 1 Chr. 1:43ff appear to be at home, at any rate as far as their residences can be located, to the east of the ʿarabah and the rivalries between the Kings of Judah and Edom concern almost exclusively the same territory "on the other side of the (Dead) sea" (2 Chr. 20:2).[2]

In the Old Testament Teman is closely linked with Edom. Teman,[3] the city, is the capital of the land of the Temanites.[4] Teman, the individual, is the grandson of Esau, the son of his first-born, Eliphaz.[5] Teman seems to be used at certain points in the Old Testament as a synonym for Edom.[6] The meaning of the name Teman is uncertain, but the most probable suggestion is that it carries the general connotation of "south."[7] An exact location cannot be given for Teman;[8] but a tentative identification has been made with Shobak, northeast of Petra.[1] Teman at times equals Edom, especially in parallelism, as in Habakkuk 3:3, where the parallelism is with Mount Paran, and as in Deuteronomy 33:2, where Paran, Sinai, and Seir are equal to Edom. At other times, as in Zechariah 9:14, Teman is "better understood in the wider and vaguer sense of 'the southland.'"[2]

---

[1] Numbers 34:3.

[2] Simons, Geographical and Topographical Texts, p. 24.

[3] Jeremiah 49:7, 20; Ezekiel 25:13; Amos 1:12; Obadiah 9; Baruch 3:22, 23.

[4] Genesis 36:34; I Chronicles 1:45. [5] Genesis 36:15.

[6] Jeremiah 49:7; Amos 1:12; Obadiah 9.

[7] Simons, Geographical and Topographical Texts, p. 90; James Sheppard Irvine, "The Early History of Edom. A Study of the Land of Edom and Its Inhabitants from Prehistoric Times to 922 B.C." (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1958), p. 128; Eduard Meyer, Die Israeliten und Ihre Nachbarstämme (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1906), p. 347. Meyer suggests that the name is gentilic: Taim, an element meaning "worshipper" or "servant" in Arabic names, joined with a theophorous element, -an.

[8] Teman is the home of Eliphaz in Job 2:11, 4:1, 15:1, 22:1, 42:7, 9. It is perhaps more than interesting to note that in Genesis 36:15 Eliphaz, son of Esau, is the father of Teman.

From the accounts of the Exodus and wilderness wanderings in the Biblical records, little can be learned as to the exact geographical boundaries of Edom. The JE tradition[3] in Numbers 20 and 21 relates how, in response to Moses' request from Kadesh, the hostile attitude of the Edomites forced the Israelites to circumvent their territory. Their route went from Kadesh (on Edom's border[4]), by way of Mount Hor (on the border of the land of Edom[5]) and the yam suph (no doubt the Gulf of Aqabah), around the eastern border of Edom and Moab[6] to the territory of Sihon, King of the Amorites. The D tradition[7] is quite different, there being no mention of a request for passage through Edom and no evidence of refusal or opposition. Deuteronomy 2:4 relates the command of Yahweh given through Moses: "You are about to pass through the territory of your brothers, the sons of Esau . . . they will be afraid of you." According to the Deuteronomist, after the turn northward from "the wilderness in the direction of the *yam suph*,"[1] the Israelites continued "through[2] [the territory of] our brothers the sons of Esau who live in Seir, on the Arabah road[3] from Elath and Ezion-geber."[4] The two traditions of Numbers and Deuteronomy, later harmonized, reflect awareness of at least two incursions, perhaps three, into Palestine, either two from the east and one from the south or perhaps one from the east and one from the south, by those who later were bound together in the twelve tribe confederacy in the unification around Yahweh-worship. In one instance the Edomites were unwilling to permit passage through their territory, and in another they were willing.[1] The problems of the routes, dates, leaders, and events are most difficult and intriguing but must be left here without further comment in recognition of the purpose and scope of this discussion.[2] There are many other references to Edom in the Old Testament; however, they are of little significance for geographical study.

---

[1] Simons, Geographical and Topographical Texts, p. 90.

[2] Ibid. There was a desert oasis, "Teima," where Nabonidus lived for seven or eight years. An Aramaic fragment found in cave IV at Qumrân calls the place name "Teiman," but Teima cannot be identified with Teman. See André Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings from Qumran, translated by G. Vermes (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961), pp. 321 ff.

[3] George Buchanan Gray, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Numbers ("International Critical Commentary," edited by C. A. Briggs, S. R. Driver, and Alfred Plummer, vol. IV, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), p. 264; Robert H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948), p. 171.

[4] Numbers 20:16. [5] Numbers 20:23. [6] Numbers 21:4, 11.

[7] Samuel Rolles Driver, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy ("International Critical Commentary," edited by C. A. Briggs, S. R. Driver, and Alfred Plummer, vol. V, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903), p. lxxvi; Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 187. Pfeiffer assigns this material to R^d, dated ca. 550 B.C.

---

[1] Deuteronomy 2:1.

[2] Here reading את with the LXX and Vulgate for the מאת of the MT. Hempel, in Rudolph Kittel, ed., *Biblia Hebraica*, 3rd edition (Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1950), hereafter referred to as BH^{3}, cites this reading in the footnote: "*l frt*"--*Lege fortasse*. Simons, *Geographical and Topographical Texts*, p. 259, accepts this emendation. עבר with מן and מאת indicates "pass on away from." Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1952), p. 718, hereafter referred to as *BDB*.

[3] Here reading דרך with the LXX and Vulgate for the מדרך of the MT. Hempel, in BH^{3}, says of this reading, "*lege fortasse*." Simons, *Geographical and Topographical Texts*, p. 259, also suggests the reading, בדרך Driver, *ICC Deuteronomy*, pp. 32-35, refutes the reading as emended by Hempel, arguing that this "passage stands in no connexion with Nu. 20:14-21, which narrates the application made by Israel from Kadesh, on the *Western* border of Edom, for permission to pass *through* the Edomite territory, which was refused. That incident belongs to an earlier stage of the Israelites' wanderings, and is not noticed in Dt." (p. 34). Adam C. Welch, *Deuteronomy, the Framework to the Code* (London: Oxford University Press, 1932), pp. 169, 170, recognizes the contradiction within this second chapter of Deuteronomy and argues that the LXX and Vulgate translators adjusted their versions to avoid the contradiction. He concludes that verses 4-7 are an addition, intended "for some reason" to correct the statement that the people avoided passage through Edom. Thus, in Welch's view, the "original" D agrees with E in Numbers.

These proposed emendations under discussion are accepted by the writer. They are, it seems, in keeping with the meaning and intention of the larger passage (2:1-15) in which they stand. The prepositional additions reflect a harmonistic tendency of a Deuteronomic redactor who sensed the contradictory elements in this passage and in Numbers 20 and 21.

[4] Deuteronomy 2:8.

Interpretation of the Biblical data on the geography of Edom, coupled with results of explorations of the last century and a half, has failed to bring forth uncontested conclusions. The location of Edom's western boundary has remained the cause of difficulty. As already noted, the Biblical evidence indicates that this western boundary should include the mountainous territory west of the Wadi Arabah.[1] Frants Buhl[2] and G. L. Robinson,[3] the leading scholars on Edom of the past two generations, relying heavily on Biblical evidence, accepted this scriptural delineation of the western boundary. Extra-Biblical evidence claimed as supporting this identification is cited from an Egyptian document[4] dated in the 12th century B.C.[5] that depicts the Adumu or Edom as already extending at that date far across the peninsula of Sinai.[6] Robinson argues that, while the Ghor or Arabah may appear to the superficial observer a well-defined natural boundary,

---

[1] In view of the present confused state of the traditions, little more can be said in explanation of the varying Edomite attitude except by way of conjecture. If the permissive passage through Edom was early, perhaps this was because Edom was too weak to resist, and the later refusal of passage could have been brought about by their increased strength. If the passage permitted by the Edomites was early, perhaps they did not approve of either the conduct of the Hebrews in passage or of the resultant effects; therefore in the second instance refused permission to pass through their land. Meek is probably incorrect in contending that the Joseph tribes entered Canaan earlier under Joshua; the southern tribes later, under Moses. (Theophile J. Meek, Hebrew Origins, 2nd edition (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), pp. 21, 22, 29, 35-48). If the refusal of passage was early and the permission for passage came later, Reider is possibly correct in saying that the Israelites, at the time of the request for passage and its refusal, were a weak and disorganized array of clans. But after 38 years of organization and military training the Israelites were a mighty force, and the Edomites were afraid to refuse passage. (He continues to note that, of course, the Israelites, mighty force though they were, politely went up the difficult way through the eastern portion of Edom, not the obvious Arabah route.) (Joseph Reider, Deuteronomy, The Holy Scriptures with Commentary [Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 5708-1948], p. 23.) In either case, perhaps nothing more is involved than a change of Edomite kings or even a change of attitude on the part of a single king.

[2] The difficulties are well pointed up by Harold Henry Rowley, From Joseph to Joshua (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy for 1948, London: The British Academy, 1950), especially in his synthesis of Biblical and non-Biblical evidences, pp. 109-163. Whatever else Rowley may (or may not) accomplish in this monograph, he gives an impressive and extensive bibliography.

> it cannot be regarded as a geographical frontier in the sense that it was ever a boundary between tribes and nations. Historically it has never, so far as is known, served as a tribal boundary. Neither the Nabataeans, nor the Romans, nor the modern Arabs ever recognized the ʿArabah as a natural division of desert territory.[7]

In a development since the time of Robinson, however, the Arabah does, at the present time, constitute the Israeli-Arab border. Robinson proceeds to fix the western boundary of Edom in the mountainous area south of Cisjordanian Palestine, probably following one of the wadis through the mountains.[8] Trumbull is in general agreement but more definite, favoring a natural boundary line following the southern extension of the Wadi el-ʿArîsh.[1]

---

[1] Numbers 20:16, 34:3 f.; Joshua 15:1 ff., 11:17, 12:7; Judges 1:36.

[2] Frants Buhl, Geschichte der Edomiter (Leipzig: Alexander Edelmann, 1893), p. 22.

[3] George Livingston Robinson, The Sarcophagus of an Ancient Civilization (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1930), pp. 179-182.

[4] Papyrus Anastasi VI. Ricardo A. Caminos, Late Egyptian Miscellanies (London: Oxford University Press, 1954), p. 293.

[5] W. Max Müller, Asien und Europa (Leipzig: Wilhelm Engleman, 1893), p. 135.

[6] G. L. Robinson, Sarcophagus, p. 176.

[7] Ibid., p. 178.

[8] Ibid., p. 179.

The arguments of Frants Buhl give a fairly normative indication of scholarly consensus relative to Edom's boundaries prior to the 1930's. Buhl was not an armchair geographer: he had first-hand knowledge of at least a part of the territory of Edom. In addition to his personal observations from exploration, he relied heavily upon Biblical references. In view of the events recorded in Numbers, especially chapters 20 and 21, the location of Kadesh was pivotal. ʿAin Qudeis was recognized in Buhl's day as the site, or at least the general area, of Kadesh.[2] Thus he logically assumed, on the basis of scriptural references, that the territory of Edom was extended some forty miles west of the Wadi Arabah. However, Buhl recognized the nature of this territory between the Wadi Arabah and Kadesh--that it was very rugged and arid to the point of being uninhabitable for sedentary occupation.[3] Buhl found further evidence relating to this western boundary in Numbers 34:3 f. and Joshua 15:1, in which the Wilderness of Zin is added to the boundary points of Edom along with the Ascent of Akrabbim. He identified this ascent with Naqb es-Safiyeh or Naqb el-Yemen in the middle or south part of the Wadi Fiqreh.[4] By the use of emendations Buhl found support for his position in Judges 1:36. He emended הָאֱמֹרִי to הָאֱדֹמִי[5] and מֵהַסֶּלַע to הַסֶּלַע and read: "the border of the Edomites ran from the ascent of Akrabbim, the rock and upwards." The rock was accepted as referring to the rock struck by Moses, releasing a flow of water.[1] Thus Buhl's opinion of the western boundary was that it extended from the south end of the Dead Sea, turned southwest through the Wadi Fiqreh, south of the ascent of the Akrabbim, and continued southward through the Wadi Modra, which bordered on the north of the Wilderness of Zin, reaching ʿAin Qudeis, which marked the westernmost point of Edomite sovereignty. Thus the plateau west of the Wadi Arabah was Edomite territory. The border between Kadesh and the northern end of the Gulf of Aqabah remained, in Buhl's view, uncertain in consideration of the barrenness of the terrain. Buhl admitted that the concentration of population was in the eastern section of the country and asserted that possession of the Arabah and the western plateau was to enable the Edomites to control the flow of trade through the Arabah and ʿAin Qudeis.[2]

---

[1] H. Clay Trumbull, Kadesh-Barnea (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884), pp. 114-117. It is probably of some significance that both Trumbull and G. L. Robinson (the latter to a greater degree), not to mention others, seem quite intentionally vague at the point of the fixing of this western boundary.

[2] Buhl, Geschichte, pp. 22 ff. [3] Ibid., p. 26. [4] Ibid.

[5] This emendation is supported by the LXX Alexandrinus and Lagardiana, the Syriac Hexaplaris, and others; and it is quite generally accepted, since the ascent of Akrabbim has nothing to do with the boundary of Dan, even when the tribe was on the seacoast (Judges 1:34 ff.).

While the preceding statements reflect the consensus of the scholarly world prior to very recent times, there were a few non-conformists in earlier days who insisted that Edomite territory must be limited to the eastern side of the Arabah. Among the more important of these must be listed Burckhardt,[3] E. Robinson,[4] and W. Libbey and F. E. Hoskins.[5] The evidence from modern scholars in the area of archaeology conflicts with the conclusions reached by Buhl, G. L. Robinson, et alii, while agreeing in essence with those set forth by Burckhardt, E. Robinson, and Libbey and Hoskins. The majority of more recent work in the area of Edomite geography and history has been done by Nelson Glueck since 1933. In the spring and summer of 1934, as a part of a broad plan of exploration in Transjordan, Glueck led a joint expedition of the American School of Oriental Research, Baghdad, Hebrew Union College, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Transjordan Department of Antiquities through the territory of ancient Edom.[1] On this expedition a surface exploration was carried out in the course of which more than 250 sites were examined, particularly the potsherds found on the surface of the various sites.[2] Glueck, using pottery chronology, was able to determine with a considerable degree of accuracy the dates of the various sites. One of the major contributions of the exploratory expedition was the accurate (according to Glueck) definition of the boundaries of Edom.[3] These boundaries were determined to have been protected by a system of border fortresses, most of which were in sight of the nearest one on either side. The Edomites depended almost entirely on these border fortresses for protection, the cities having little individual means of protection.[4]

---

[1] Buhl, Geschichte, pp. 25, 26.

[2] Cf. Victor Roland Gold, "Studies in the History and Culture of Edom" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1951), pp. 4, 5.

[3] John Lewis Burckhardt, Travels in Syria and the Holy Land (London: John Murray, 1882), especially pp. 435, 436.

[4] E. Robinson, "Notes on Biblical Geography," Bibliotheca Sacra, VI (1849), 380.

[5] William Libbey and Franklin E. Hoskins, The Jordan Valley and Petra (2 volumes, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1905), II, 60.

---

[1] This was the second part of his explorations in Eastern Palestine, reported especially in Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research, XV (1934, 1935). Other parts in this series reporting explorations in Eastern Palestine are AASOR, XIV (1933, 1934) and AASOR, XXV-XXVIII (1945-1949), Parts 1 and 2.

[2] AASOR, XV, 1.

[3] Nelson Glueck has summarized the pertinent material in "The Boundaries of Edom," Hebrew Union College Annual, XI (1936), 141-157.

[4] Glueck, "The Boundaries of Edom," HUCA, XI (1936), 143. But Glueck seems to contradict himself elsewhere when he says: "The interior of Edom and

According to Glueck's findings the northern boundary of Edom lay near the Wadi el-Ḥesa, guarded by a line of fortresses overlooking its steep slopes, extending, east to west, from er-Ruweihah through Rujm Ja‘ez and Khirbet Bakher to Rujm and Khirbet Kerakeh.[1] The eastern boundary ran along the dry, uncultivated area between the desert and the sown, with fortresses including Khirbet Tawil Ifjeij, Rujm Ras el-Hala, Rujm el-Qaraneh, and probably Khirbet el-Jeheirah.[2] The southern boundary was located along the top of the Neqb overlooking the Hismeh Valley, guarded by Khirbet Neqb esh-Shtar and Khirbet esh-Shedeiyid. Glueck supposes that there perhaps existed Edomite outposts in the Hismeh Valley to protect the caravan route that led through this valley and the Wadi el-Yitm to the Arabah and the Red Sea, but he failed to discover remains of such outposts.[3] Concerning the much disputed western boundary of Edom, Glueck says: "The western boundary of Edom during the period of its independent political existence was formed by the ‘Arabah, and never extended west of the ‘Arabah."[4] He argues cogently that the Arabah was a natural line of division and the lifeline of this area but fails to acknowledge what seems to be obvious: that effective control of this lifeline of the Arabah would demand some sort of control over the western as well as the eastern contiguous

---

Moab was not, however, guarded solely by these border fortresses. Practically every site throughout the length and breadth of the land either consisted of a great fortress, or was protected by a strong central structure, around which the houses and tents of the farmers were clustered, all contained within a great enclosing wall." "Surface Finds in Edom and Moab," Palestine Exploration Quarterly, LXXI (1939), 190.

[1] Nelson Glueck, The River Jordan (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946), p. 83; also Glueck, "The Boundaries of Edom," HUCA, XI (1936), 143.

[2] Glueck, "The Boundaries of Edom," HUCA, XI (1936), 143.

[3] Nelson Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan (New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1940), p. 128. The possibility is expressed by Glueck that protection was afforded by accompanying armed guards (p. 129).

[4] Glueck, "The Boundaries of Edom," HUCA, XI (1936), 144.

territory. Overwhelming is the evidence marshaled by Glueck that in the period of Edom's dominance there was no significant sedentary population west of the Arabah, but this does not preclude either nomadic or semi-nomadic occupancy. That there were thriving commercial and industrial towns in Edom does not rule out, especially in a country so climatically oriented toward nomadism, the contemporaneous existence of nomadic or semi-nomadic population elements. The area west of the Wadi Arabah needed little more than such a population to assure Edomite control. The aridity of the territory precluded sedentary occupancy, and the nature of the terrain served as an effective barrier against sudden or massive enemy attack. The artifacts of Edomite civilization are absent; but the western highlands were, in all probability, either a part of Edom or under Edomite control. Glueck seems to have no doubt that he has once and for all settled the question of the boundaries of Edom. Unfortunately the question is not so simple that resolving it can rest upon archaeological survey and exploration and explanation of seemingly contradicting Biblical passages as "not . . . properly understood."[1]

Pre-Edomite Seir

This land of Edom has an ancient history of occupancy. It was not historically known as "Edomite" until the 13th century B.C. Perhaps it belonged to other nomadic groups, the Edomites coming later. Or perhaps the Edomites, at least their ancestors, were there much earlier, simply having no towns and were known as "Horites."[2] It continued to be the land of the Edomites until the 6th century B.C.[1] The origin of the Edomites is lost in the haze of antiquity, with the few remaining clues to their origin to be found in Old Testament references and in etymological considerations.

---

[1] Glueck, "The Boundaries of Edom," HUCA, XI (1936), 144. Glueck classifies "all" passages which place Edom-Seir west of the Arabah as "in their present form" from the Exilic period or later. The Other Side of the Jordan, p. 134.

[2] See *infra*, pp. 21, 22.

In the Biblical tradition the Edomites were understood to be the descendants of Esau, the elder twin brother of Jacob, son of Isaac and Rebekah. This Esau-Edom relationship is first expressly alluded to in the account in Genesis 25:30 (J),[2] in which Esau asks Jacob for "some of the red pottage" (מִן הָאָדֹם הָאָדֹם) for which he barters away his birthright. It seems a parenthetical note when the writer adds that because of this event Esau's name was called Edom (אֱדוֹם). It is evident, however, that the naming of Esau at birth in the account of Genesis 25:25 (J or JE)[3] is an earlier allusion to this Esau-Edom identification. Related to this identification is undoubtedly the description of the newborn infant as having come forth from the womb "red" (אַדְמוֹנִי), with all his body as a "hairy mantle" (שֵׂעָר).[4]

---

[1] In the light of Biblical tradition, secular historical material, and archaeological discoveries, the term "Edom" can be used properly only to refer to the land or nation during the span from late or post-Patriarchal times to within the Old Testament post-Exilic period. For Inter-Testamental and New Testament times, the terms Idumaean, referring to the descendants of the Edomites, and Nabataean, referring to the country formerly occupied by the Edomites and its inhabitants, are correct. As will be discussed more fully later (infra, pp. 53 ff.), the Nabataeans partially drove from their homeland, partially absorbed the Edomites by the 4th century B.C. The Nabataean Kingdom was established with its capital at Petra in Edomite Territory. The displaced Edomites settled in Southern Judah and were henceforth known as Idumaeans.

[2] John Skinner, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Genesis ("International Critical Commentary," edited by C. A. Briggs, S. R. Driver, and Alfred Plummer, vol. I, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clarke, 1910), pp. 361, 362; Samuel Rolles Driver, The Book of Genesis ("Westminster Commentaries," edited by Walter Lock, London: Methuen and Company, 1906), p. 248.

[3] Skinner, ICC Genesis, pp. 359, 360; Driver, WC Genesis, p. 245.

[4] "Hairy" (שער) is to be equated with Seir, the name of the land where Esau later settled. When the term is applied to a district, a wooded or shrubby appearance might be implied. G. A. Smith, "The Land of Edom," The

The name Edom (אֱדוֹם) is used for both the land of Edom and the inhabitants of the land; but the primary reference of Edom in the Old Testament is to the people rather than to the land. In the majority of instances other terms are used for the territory of Edom.[1] The etymology of אֱדוֹם [2] is widely disputed,[3] with agreement ending with the statement that the root of אֱדוֹם is אדם . Any course beyond this point is filled with uncertainty and differences of opinion and must lie in the area of interpretation. There

---

Expositor, VI (1908), 327. The etymology of עשו is explained by way of the Arabic, ġašiya, covered, as indicating one covered, as with hair. G. R. Driver, "Problems and Solutions," Vetus Testamentum, IV (1954), 243. Similar conclusions are pointed to in Joseph Reider, "Etymological Studies in Biblical Hebrew," VT, IV (1954), 284-292.

[1] "Land of Edom" (אֶרֶץ אֱדוֹם), Genesis 36:16 ff. (P); I Kings 9:26; Isaiah 34:6; etc. "Field of Edom" (שְׂדֵה אֱדוֹם), Genesis 32:4 (JE); Judges 5:4; etc. "Land of Seir" (אַרְצָה שֵׂעִיר), Genesis 32:4 (JE), "Mount Seir" (הַר שֵׂעִיר) Genesis 14:6 (P), 36:8 f. (R^P); Deuteronomy 1:2, 2:1-5; Joshua 24:4. "Seir" (שֵׂעִיר), Deuteronomy 2:4, etc., 32:2; Judges 5:4; Isaiah 31:11. "Mountain of Esau" (הַר עֵשָׂו), Obadiah 8 f., 19, 21. The Edomites are often called also "Esau" or "Sons of Esau."

[2] See BDB, p. 10 for a detailed list of Old Testament references.

[3] The general consensus is well stated by Smith: "It is perhaps impossible to trace with certainty the origins and meanings of these words [Edom, Esau, and Seir]." He points out that many Arab tribal names can be traced to an ancestor, locality, sacred animal, or crisis, but "none of these is clear in the case of Edom, ʿEsau, or Seʿir." ("The Land of Edom," The Expositor, VI (1908), 326.) The root אדם is far from being rare. אֱדוֹם is usually derived from a second root, אדם separate from that from which אָדָם , man or mankind, and אֲדָמָה , ground or land, are derived. The derivatives from this root are verb, אָדֹם , אָדֵם be red; adjective, אָדֹם red; noun, אֹדֶם carnelian; noun, אֱדֹם name of a condiment; proper noun, אֱדוֹם , Edom; gentilic adjective, אֲדֹמִי , Edomite; adjective, אֲדַמְדָּם reddish; and adjective, אַדְמֹנִי , red, ruddy. The basic signification, according to this analysis of the root, is red or redness. This root appears in Arabic, Ethiopic, and perhaps Assyrian, with the general connotation of "Tawny." (BDB, p. 10.) G. A. Smith, "The Land of Edom," argues that אֲדָמָה soil or ground (cultivable), seems to come from the same root as אֱדוֹם . He further notes that in Sabaean the word is applied to subjects or clients, and that in Assyrian the root means to produce or make (p. 327).

are at least three primary schools of thought on this interpretative problem. The root has been considered that from which אָדָם , man or mankind, comes, the supposition being that אֱדוֹם is an older form.[1] אֱדוֹם has also been explained as the name of a local deity.[2] But the etymological explanation that seems to be best attested and most widely accepted (and that which is here accepted) is that אֱדוֹם comes from the Semitic root אדם , meaning basically red or redness, reflecting the natural coloration of the land in which Edom lived: "the Red Land." The sandstone composition of the hills east of the Wadi Arabah gives good reason for the application of such a name to this land and consequently to its inhabitants.[1] The name "Edom" appears with considerable sparsity in extra-Biblical sources: in Egyptian as *ʾAdum(a)*, probably reflecting west Semitic *ʾAdom*;[2] in Assyrian as *Udum(a)*;[3] and in Ugaritic as *ʾudm*.[4]

---

[1] Frederick Baethgen, *Beiträge zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte* (Berlin: H. Reuther's Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1888), p. 10. Theodor Nöldeke, "Edom," *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (4 volumes, edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1901), II, col. 1182. This is also reported to be the view of W. F. Albright by Victor Gold "Studies in the History and Culture of Edom," p. 87).

[2] S. A. Cook, "Edom," *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (14th edition, London: Encyclopaedia Britannica Company, 1929), VIII, 949; Eduard Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* (Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1954), bd. 1, heft. 2, p. 401, par. 343; A. H. Sayce, "Edom, Edomites," *Hastings Dictionary of the Bible* (edited by James Hastings, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902), I, 644; W. Robertson Smith, Lectures on the Religion of the Semites (3rd edition with Introduction and Notes by S. A. Cook, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927), pp. 42, 43; S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Text of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1890), p. 206; Skinner, *ICC Genesis*, p. 431; S. A. Cook, *The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology* (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy for 1925, London: The British Academy, 1930), pp. 109, 112. W. Carleton Wood, "The Religion of Canaan," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XXXV (1916), 264, 265, connects Esau and Edom as separate gods with the same function, or perhaps these are two names for the same god. Gold reports the view of Dupont-Sommer (*Revue d'Assyriologie*, XL [1947], 201 ff.), who contends that אדם is the earth-god, who, linked with Baal, the god of heaven, form a divine couple. He suggests the possibility that from this god Edom derives its name. The possibility that such an interesting and well-informed scholar as Dupont-Sommer is correct must be recognized; but perhaps it is permissible to comment (along with Gold, "Studies in the History and Culture of Edom," p. 87) that the name of the god (?) appears only twice in extant material and that, if the god, אדם , were the complement of Baal, one would expect more prevalent references. Added evidence shows that the name is not used as a compound in names (with the possible exception of Obed-Edom in II Samuel 6:10). If this god did belong to the Phoenician pantheon along with Baal, its appearance in Ugaritic materials would be expected; but there it does not appear. (Cf. W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1942], pp. 71 ff.)

For a discussion of the early history of the land of Seir and its inhabitants much dependence must be placed on the Biblical accounts, although some scattered references have been discovered in other sources.[1] From Biblical tradition it is learned that Esau, the progenitor of Edom, settled along with his family in Seir.[2] These early "Edomites" probably represent a detached band of nomadic people who lived in the desert area south of Palestine and who are mentioned in Egyptian texts[3] as, on occasion, penetrating with their flocks to and within the borders of Egypt.[4] The tradition of the Old Testament represents the Edomites (בני אדום)as having driven the Horites (or בני שעיר) from the land of Seir, either replacing or, perhaps in part, absorbing them.[5] Other elements of desert peoples, such as the Ishmaelites and Amalekites, seem to have been absorbed also by the new

---

[1] A. H. Sayce, "Edom, Edomites," *Hastings Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 644; W. F. Albright, "The Oracles of Balaam," *JBL*, LXIII (1944), 229; Albright, "Two Little Understood Amarna Letters from the Middle Jordan Valley," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, LXXXIX (1943), 14. W. Lawing, "Edom, Edomites," *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia* (5 volumes, edited by James Orr, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957), I, 899; and many others. In relation to this view one must cite II Kings 3:22 and Isaiah 63:2, where words from the root אדם are descriptive of blood. The possibility must also be recognized that אֲדָמָה , ground, may have originally had the particular connotation of the "red ploughed ground" and that אָדָם , man, may be related to this same root indicating "reddish," the color of man. (Cf. Gold, "Studies in the History and Culture of Edom," p. 87. Ludwig Köhler, *Hebrew Man* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), translated by Peter R. Ackroyd, pp. 22, 23, comments in this connection: " . . . Esau is called *ʾadmoni*, that is, the reddish brown of the Palestinian lentils, which are called *ʾadom*, reddish brown (Gen. 25:30). The people descended from Esau are thence called *ʾedom*, the Edomites, or reddish-brown people. The fact that the Hebrews called them this must mean that they thought of themselves as being lighter, more yellowish in color . . . ."

[2] W. F. Albright, *The Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography* (volume VI in the "*American Oriental Series*," edited by W. Norman Brown, John K. Shyrock, and E. A. Speiser, New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1934), p. 34.

[3] R. C. Thompson, *The Prisms of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal* (London: The British Museum, 1931), p. 25; Fritz Hommel, *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, translated by Edmond McClure and Leonard Crosslé (London: SPCK, 1897), pp. 261-263. The latter accepts the Amarna references as relating to the land of Edom.

[4] Gold, "Studies in the History and Culture of Edom," p. 86, and Robert DeLanghe, *Les Textes de Ras Shamra-Ugarit et leurs Rapports avec le Milieu Biblique de l'Ancient Testament* (Part II, Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1945), pp. 140, 141, suggest that the Ugaritic references are to a place other than the Biblical land of Edom. Rowley, *From Joseph to Joshua*, pp. 21, 22, presents arguments relating to both identifications, including variations.

---

[1] Irvine, "The Early History of Edom," pp. 6-8, suggests and lists relevant extant material: the Egyptian Execration texts, 20th-19th centuries B.C., make no mention of Edom but contain names of Asiatic princes and lands, some Transjordanian; later are the 14th century B.C. Amarna Letters, not mentioning Edom, but depicting the milieu in which the Kingdom of Edom emerges; in Egyptian records Edom is mentioned in the records of Rameses II, Merneptah, Rameses III, and Shishak; from Mesopotamian regions the Mari Letters (18th century B.C.) give evidence for a study of Edomite personal and place names; the Nuzi Documents (15th century B.C.) reflect social customs of the time of the Esau stories settings. Ugaritic sources furnish economic, social, and religious data that are properly applicable to Edom; from Arabia come the proto-Arabic inscriptions, a source for Edomite name studies; and from Transjordan and Cisjordan come seal impressions and ostraca. Irvine comments: "Nearly every discovery in the Near East and adjacent regions has made available source material for the understanding of Edom, influenced by Mesopotamia, Asia Minor, Palestine, Egypt, and Arabia, a crossroads of the ancient near east" (p. 8). The materials in Irvine's listing cited above will be referred to later as they refer to the history of Edom proper.

The Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament, with its insistent tradition of Edomite relation, must be noted as possible evidence concerning early Edom. See *infra*, p. 30.

[2] Or "the hill country of Seir," Genesis 36:8, 9; or "the hill country of Esau," Obadiah 8, 9, 19, 21.

[3] Papyrus Anastasi VI, Caminos, *Late Egyptian Miscellanies*, p. 293.

[4] Simons, *Geographical and Topographical Texts*, p. 23.

[5] Genesis 14:6, 36:20, 30; Deuteronomy 12:22. Simons, *Geographical and Topographical Texts*, p. 44, argues logically that in Genesis 36:2 the MT "Hivite" must be emended to "Horite," in accordance with 36:20. He also sug-

---

gests that in Genesis 26:34, "Hittite" may be a copyist's error for "Horite." Cf. also E. A. Speiser, *AASOR*, XIII (1933), 29 ff.

The Horites have often been described as "cave-dwellers." Perhaps they were, but there is no conclusive support for this identification. One factor involved in this identification is that there are, and were, caves in Seir; but G. E. Wright, "Troglodytes and Giants in Palestine," *JBL*, LVII (1938), 308, 309, finds no evidence supporting this identification in the area of Petra, where the caves are artificial and Nabataean in origin. Glueck's theory of no sedentary population in Edom between the 19th and 13th centuries B.C. would rule against such Horite identification. A second factor in this identification is that there is an etymological possibility of relating "Horite" with חר , cave or hole; thus the Horites would be by etymological supposition cave-dwellers. In support of the Horite-cave-dweller identification see: Simons, *Geographical and Topographical Texts*, p. 44; S. R. Driver, *WC Genesis*, p. 316; Driver, *ICC Deuteronomy*, p. 38; G. L. Robinson, *Sarcophagus*, pp. 316-319. However, Glueck states emphatically that "there are no archaeological traces of Horites in either the hill country of Edom or the Wadi Arabah or in southernmost Palestine, unless the Horites are to be understood purely nomadic groups, such as the Edomites must have found and conquered when they entered southern Transjordan." (*The Other Side of the Jordan*, p. 149; see also Glueck, "The Boundaries of Edom," *HUCA*, XI (1936), 141.

Probably the Horites were not cave-dwellers but were, in reality, the Hurrians, who may have moved into this area, gaining some effective control over its nomadic occupants, along with the Hyksos irruption from the north about the 18th century (according to Albright). "The Hebrew Hori (Greek Khorraios) cannot well be separated from Canaanite *Khry*, which represents an older consonantal form of the name." (W. F. Albright, "The Horites in Palestine," *From the Pyramids to Paul*, edited by Lewis Gaston Leary [New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1935], p. 19, cf. also pp. 9-26.) The view of Meek is generally the same: he would have the Hurrians precede the Hyksos by a few years. About their identification with the Horites, he leaves no question: " . . . the name *Hori* (Horite), [is] the exact Hebrew equivalent of the cuneiform Hurru (Hurrian)." (*Hebrew Origins*, p. 4.)

Although he admits a Hurrian influx into or through Edom, Albright stands alone in arguing that the pre-Edomite inhabitants of Seir were Hivites rather than Horites-Hurrians. The significant elements of his argument are: (1) It is unlikely, in view of the reliability of Jewish historical tradition, that the Hivites (or Horites) are fictitious; the ethnic group of Hivites must be accounted for. (2) The Hurrians were sedentary peoples, but Glueck has demonstrated that whoever occupied Edom immediately prior to the Edomites had no sedentary civilization there. (3) The Horite clan names (Genesis 36:20-30) are clearly Semitic; Hurrian names and language are unrelated to Semitic; (4) There is not a better available spot to locate the Hivites than in Edom. (5) The name "Hivite" can be explained etymologically to indicate something like "camp" or "group of tents." Thus the Hivites could easily be the nomadic or semi-nomadic group from which the Edomites wrested the land ca. 1250 B.C. (Albright, "The Horites in Palestine," *From the Pyramids to Paul*, pp. 21-

inhabitants of Seir.[1]

Reference is made to the pre-Edomite inhabitants of Seir in Genesis 14 in the account of the conquest of the "cities of the plain" by Chedorlaomer and his allies. Among the conquests of these four kings from the east were "the Horites in their Mount Seir as far as El-paran on the border of the wilderness."[2] The literary character and composition of this passage have long been sources of difficulty for scholars,[3] and the reliability of this account is open to serious question.[4] For purposes of this discussion no more

---

24.) This viewpoint is very interesting and suggestive but lacking in sufficient supporting evidence. The Horites and the Hivites were, in all probability, either the same or closely related, having become confused in the Old Testament text because of the similarity of the ו and the ר.

[1] Genesis 28:9, 36.

[2] Genesis 14:6.

[3] In literary analysis many suggestions have been made, but no indisputable conclusions have been reached. There are literary, especially vocabularic, affinities with P; but these are sporadic. In addition there are antiquarian glosses and archaic names, suggesting possible use of an ancient document, without close parallel in the Pentateuch. Skinner says confidently "that the chapter as it now stands cannot be assigned to any of the three sources of Genesis is now universally acknowledged . . . ." Suggestions have ranged from the possession of an ancient literary kernel by J or E to the existence of an original cuneiform document of legendary and mythical character edited first by E and then by J. (This unusual and very doubtful theory is attributed to Hugo Winckler.) (Skinner, *ICC Genesis*, p. 256.) Driver, *WC Genesis*, p. 155, attributes this section to a special source (SS) with affinities with P, to be dated not earlier than the age of Ezekiel. This passage is assigned by Pfeiffer to his "S" source. (Robert H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, p. 131.) Albright discusses this chapter, especially some of the names in it, concluding that the chapter is of ancient content and dating the personalities therein in the 19th century B.C. or a little later. He further concludes that the transmission of this and other Abraham narratives must be traced to "the Hebrew descendants of the caravaneers of the 19th century" B.C., whom he identifies as the *ʿApiru*. (W. F. Albright, "Abram the Hebrew," *BASOR*, CLXIII (1961), 48-54.

[4] Especially the route of the invading armies, leaving the main engagement until the conclusion of a long and exhausting campaign and leaving the main confederation of enemies at their rear; also the account of the defeat of the entire army of the Eastern kings by 318 men, although the former had just defeated a coalition of five kings. Cf. Skinner, *ICC Genesis*, pp. 271-276.

can be concluded than that the persisting tradition was that in early times the Horites occupied the land of Seir. Nelson Glueck contends that the account must be accepted as historical, however, in the light of archaeological evidence discovered in his survey of Edom. He has found evidence of a civilization of high achievement in existence in Transjordan (he includes Ammon, Moab, and Edom) that flourished between the 21st and 19th centuries B.C. Then, about 1900 B.C. there was a thoroughgoing destruction visited upon "all the fortresses and settlements of the land," to the extent that this particular civilization never recovered. The cities were not rebuilt, and the land belonged to nomads for centuries until the establishment of the Kingdom of Edom in the 13th century.[1]

Additional Biblical material on early Seir is found in Genesis 36, where two Horite lists are recorded: a genealogy in 20-28 and a list of clans in 29, 30. These passages, like the one in chapter 14, are a source of difficulty to literary critics.[2] The contribution of the listing of the clans, families, and clan-chiefs of the Horites, the sons of Seir, to this study is simply to state again the tradition that the pre-Edomite inhabitants of Seir were the Horites.[3] The general caption in Genesis 36:9 with what should be taken as subcaptions over following sections (36:10, 15, 20, 31, 40) may well suggest that the aboriginal inhabitants of Seir were ultimately absorbed by the Edomites. The situation may well have been parallel to the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites: Horite communities existed alongside those of the Edomite invaders, and gradual amalgamation took place.[1]

---

[1] Nelson Glueck, Rivers in the Desert (New York: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 5719-1959), p. 11; Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan, p. 114.

[2] The bulk of chapter 36 is usually assigned to P, although, as Skinner notes concerning vv. 20-30, "there are no positive reasons for assigning it to J or any other source." (Skinner, ICC Genesis, p. 429.) Driver is also uncertain at this point. (Driver, WC Genesis, p. 313.) Pfeiffer assigns this section to "S." (Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 131.)

[3] Irvine, "The Early History of Edom," has a detailed analysis of the names found in this 36th chapter of Genesis. G. L. Robinson, Sarcophagus, pp. 324-326, lists twelve items derived by analysis of Genesis 36:20-30 that he calls noteworthy statements and implications. Perhaps the most important no-

Genesis 38 and I Chronicles 1 list the descendants of Esau, their clans and chiefs, and their kings who ruled Edom before the establishment of a monarchy in Israel. In the absence of other material concerning the occupation and civilization of Edom prior to the time of the Exodus, only conjectures can be made. Practically all evidence for this period relative to Edom is negative: there is no mention in Biblical records, and the results of Glueck's surveys indicate no sedentary occupation from the Early Bronze Age to the Iron Age in Ammon, Moab and Edom.[2] The end of the Early Bronze Age was marked by destruction of the existing civilization, either by invasion such as is reflected in Genesis 14 or by warlike nomads, and Seir was settled by nomadic or semi-nomadic peoples of inferior culture. But probably there was little for

---

tation is concerning the prevalence of animal names in the Horite name list. It is interesting, but conjectural, to note that many Hebrew names were originally animal names and to raise the question concerning Edomite elements in the makeup of the twelve tribes of Israel, especially in the southern tribes, as Caleb (dog), recognizing the Edomite affinities of the Caleb clan of Judah. Cf. also on animal names of non-Israelites, the appendix, "Die Profanen Namen," in Martin Noth, Die Israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der Gemeinsemitischen Namengebung ("Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament," edited by Rudolf Kittel, Ser. 3, No. 10, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1928), esp. p. 230.

[1] This in spite of the statement of the Deuteronomist that the Edomites "destroyed the Horites before them, and they dispossessed them, and settled in their stead even to this day." (Deuteronomy 2:22) Similarly the Hebrews are said to have conquered the entire land of Canaan (Joshua 11:23). Cf. G. L. Robinson, Sarcophagus, pp. 326, 327.

[2] Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan, p. 121.

them to conquer in Edom, so there was little effect of the Hyksos upon the nomadic population. This may be too much to assume, however. The conclusions of Glueck relative to the absence of sedentary population that he applied to Ammon and Moab as well as to Edom have recently been called into question. G. Lankester Harding cites evidence contrary to Glueck's analysis of this situation in eastern Palestine. Pottery and other objects characteristic of Hyksos culture of the Middle Bronze Age have been found in tombs at Amman, Naʿûr, and Mount Nebo. The Hyksos came from the north about the time of transition from the Early to the Middle Bronze Age. He points out that "large family tombs well equipped with burial objects, such as those found at Amman and Naʿûr, are not the work of nomads."[1] In the course of excavation for a new airport at Amman, a small temple was discovered containing much pottery and other objects, including imported pottery of Mycenae and Cyprus and Egyptian stone vases, all typical of the age 1600-1300 B.C. (Late Bronze).[2] An urban population in Amman in this period is thus required, for a temple would not have existed without worshippers and priests. In addition to these evidences, a large tomb was found at Madaba, dating from the end of the Late Bronze to the Early Iron Ages. Commenting on the relation of these recent discoveries to Glueck's surveys and conclusions based thereupon, Harding says:

> At the time the survey referred to [Glueck's] was made we had no groups of local pottery dated in the Middle and Late Bronze Ages, and it was the absence of imported wares so common in Palestine at that time that suggested an unoccupied country. From the recently found and well-dated groups we see that the local pottery of this period is slightly different from that of contemporary Palestine, so maybe the sherds found during the survey should be re-examined in the light of these finds. At least we know that Amman was flourishing then, for the temple, though small, was a rich one.[3]

---

[1] G. Lankester Harding, The Antiquities of Jordan (London: Lutterworth Press, 1959), p. 33.

[2] Ibid., pp. 33, 63.

[3] Ibid., p. 33.

In view of these recent archaeological evidences from Transjordan, the statement of definitive conclusions relative to the history of Seir prior to the 13th century B.C. must await the re-examination of evidence and, more particularly, stratigraphic excavation of sites in Edom. It is possible that, if Glueck's conclusions concerning the absence of sedentary occupation in Ammon were in error, his conclusions in this regard concerning Edom were likewise.

It must be pointed out that little excavation has been done in the territory occupied by the Edomites. Extensive excavation in this area is limited to Tell el-Kheleifeh, which dates only as early as the time of Solomon.[1] There have been, especially recently, some limited excavations in the territory of the ancient Edomites,[2] but little relating to Edom has been discovered. Until the time when further excavations are made and the results of additional study of existing material are available, the history of pre-

---

[1] Glueck, *The Other Side of the Jordan*, p. 104.

[2] Much excavation has been done at Petra, but that this was a permanently settled Edomite site has not been conclusively established. It has been assumed that the Edomites were in Petra before the Nabataeans pushed them to the north and west. (Ditlef Nielsen, "The Mountain Sanctuaries in Petra and Its Environs," *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, XIII (1933), 199.) More recent work has revealed evidence of Iron Age-Edomite occupation, but it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that this was a permanently inhabited settlement. (Harding, *Antiquities of Jordan*, p. 118; William H. Morton, "Umm el-Biyara," *Biblical Archaeologist*, XIX (1956), 26-36.) Other recent Petra discoveries do not relate particularly to Edom. (Peter J. Parr, "Recent Discoveries at Petra," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, LXXXIX (1957), 5-16; Parr, "Excavations at Petra, 1958-59," *PEQ*, XCII (1960), 124-135; Philip C. Hammond, "Excavations at Petra in 1959," *BASOR*, CLIX (1960), 26-31.)

Recently some archaeological work has been done in the land of ancient Edom by Miss Diana Kirkbride. Her work has been primarily with Neolithic sites and has given no significant information on Edom. (E. F. Zeuner with Diana Kirkbride and Barry C. Park, "Stone Age Explorations in Jordan, I," *PEQ*, LXXXIX (1957), 51-54; Diana V. W. Kirkbride, "Short Notes on Some Hitherto Unrecorded Prehistoric Sites in Transjordan," *PEQ*, LXI (1959), 52-54; Kirkbride, "The Excavation of a Neolithic Village at Seyl Aqlat, Beidha, Near Petra," *PEQ*, LXII (1960), 136-145.)

Edomite Seir must remain in doubt.

The Kingdom of Edom: Establishment and Early History

A more fortunate situation exists for the student of Edom's history beginning with the 13th century B.C. There are Biblical references, archaeological evidences, and extant materials from adjacent civilizations contributing their collective information toward the reconstruction of the history of Edom. About the beginning of the 13th century B.C. a strong and highly developed civilization appeared in Edom, as well as in Moab, Ammon, and the Transjordanian kingdoms of the Amorites.[1] The supposition of Glueck is that probably in the latter part of the 14th century B.C., with both Egypt and Assyria weak, there came an influx of Bedouin or semi-nomadic peoples from the desert areas to the south, absorbing or dispossessing the semi-nomadic inhabitants who had developed no sedentary civilization while having held the land since ca. 1900 B.C. This movement encompassed the Transjordanian area from Lake Huleh to the Gulf of Aqabah. The subsequent division of the land into five kingdoms[2] was influenced probably by both the separate tribal groups of the invaders and the topographical divisions of the land. The kingdom of Edom developed rapidly during this Late Bronze-Early Iron Age into a highly advanced, strongly organized, and internally well-integrated kingdom.[3] The agricultural potential of the territory was used to good advantage. Sites that have been examined reveal these Transjordanian settlers were skilled in agriculture, tilling the slopes of the hills below the towns and the steep banks of the wadis by means of terraces.[1] This system of conservation and intensive use of arable land and available rainfall had been begun before them and was developed to an even higher degree of efficiency by the later Nabataeans. It is logical to assume with Glueck that, were the same measures applied to the land in Edom today, the land could again produce to the extent of supporting a limited sedentary population, since there have been no significant changes in the climate or average precipitation since about the 8th millennium B.C.[2] The presence of copper mines in Edom has been amply demonstrated, but it is not clear to what extent these were worked by the Edomites

---

[1] Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan, p. 125.

[2] From north to south, the two Amorite kingdoms of Gilead, Ammon, Moab, and Edom.

[3] Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan, pp. 127, 128.

---

1. M. E. Kirk, "An Outline of the Ancient Cultural History of Transjordan," PEQ, LXXVI (1944), 187, 188.

2. Glueck, Rivers in the Desert, pp. 1-12; Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan, p. 26. The theory has been advanced, primarily by Ellsworth Huntington, that periods of settlement and abandonment in the region of Edom, as elsewhere in the area, can be properly explained by precipitation cycles and that, since Edomite-Nabataean times, the increasing diminution of rainfall and the corresponding dessication of the soil have rendered the land uninhabitable in the present day for a sedentary civilization. Glueck disagrees, finding the explanation for settlement-abandonment in "strictly human, more particularly in political and economic factors than in climatic changes." (The Other Side of the Jordan, p. 26.) Huntington's theory has not been demonstrated; neither has Glueck's. Several centuries of exact measurement of annual rainfall at various points in Edom would be necessary to settle the question. The theory of Huntington deserves some mention. He bases his arguments on five lines of evidence: the density of population, the distribution of forests [part of Edom was forested until recent times, probably more in antiquity], ancient migrations and invasions, the location and water supply of ancient ruins, and the fluctuation of the surface level of the Dead Sea. (Ellsworth Huntington, Palestine and Its Transformation [Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1911], pp. 249-416, esp. pp. 371-404.) C. F. Arden-Close comments on Huntington's theory: "An ingenious theory which our descendants and successors some hundreds of years hence may be able to test more effectively." (C. F. Arden-Close, "The Fainfall of Palestine," PEQ, LXXIII (1941), 122-128.)

in the period of their independent existence. It is almost certain that they were worked in this period but on a smaller scale than during the time of Israelite domination. It is known that the Egyptians worked copper and turquoise mines in Sinai as early as the 3rd millennium B.C. Probably the Edomites as well as their predecessors in Seir carried on some mining operations.[1]

The strategic position of Edom, especially with the "King's Highway" traversing the length of its territory, gave opportunity for control of, enrichment from, and participation in ancient commerce, particularly that between Egypt, Arabia, and India (by way of Arabia) and the regions to the north. The Kingdom of Edom became strong and relatively wealthy. Perhaps Kirk is correct in stating that Edom became a powerful military nation. At any rate, the presence of the strong and well-situated border fortresses and the significant decrease in the thickness of protecting walls of individual cities bear witness to a kingdom with strong central authority and national unity.[1] The account in Numbers 20 indicates that the Kingdom of Edom was sufficiently strong to admit or refuse entry of other peoples into its borders.

---

[1] M. E. Kirk, "An Outline of the Ancient Cultural History of Transjordan," PEQ, LXXVI (1944), 185. Glueck suggests that mining, smelting, and refining operations were carried on in the whole length of the Arabah from the beginning of the Early Iron Age and probably in the Bronze Age. He states that it is very probable that the Kenites, natives of these mining regions (whose very name indicates they were smiths), introduced mining to Edomite culture (the Kenites being connected with the Edomites through the Kenizzites). Cf. Genesis 15:19, 36:10-42; I Chronicles 1:36, 53. (Glueck, "Kenites and Kenizzites," PEQ, LXXII (1940), 22; Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan, p. 83.) Glueck further states: "That the Kenites were at home in Edom and the Wadi Arabah is indicated by Balaam's punning proverb with regard to them in Numbers 24, 21: 'Everlasting is thy habitation, and set in the Rock (Sela) is thy Nest (Qen).' The pun on Qen and Kenite (Qenite) is obvious, and Sela is to be identified with Umm el-Biyarah in Petra. The Bible tells us that Tubal Cain (a Kenite) was the first forger of copper and iron instruments. [Gen. 4:22] It is stated in Chronicles [I, 4:12-14] that the Kenizzites lived in the Valley of Smiths. We believe that this means the Wadi Arabah, with its many copper and iron mining and smelting sites, and that the City of Copper mentioned in connection with the Valley of Smiths is to be identified with the large Iron Age mining and smelting site of Khirbet Nahas (the Copper Ruin), located near the north end of the Wadi Arabah." (Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan, p. 83.) The conclusions of Glueck concerning mining and smelting in the Arabah are open to criticism and in many elements are incorrect, according to Beno Rothenberg, "Ancient Copper Industries in the Western Arabah," PEQ, XCIV (1962), 5-71. The date of extensive mining operations is limited by Rothenberg to the 10th century B.C. (ibid., p. 38).

The Kingdom of Edom: Its Culture

Little is known of the cultural development of Edom in the Iron Age. Their pottery skills were well developed and were comparable to those practiced in nearby areas which are better known today. Characteristic Edomite pottery is described as "well made on the wheel, and is of a creamy texture with a highly polished white slip decorated with two parallel horizontal bands of dark brown, having deep red zig-zag wedges above the upper band, and black vertical bands under the lower one."[2] This pottery gives added evidence of a highly developed civilization. While very similar to contemporary Palestinian ware, Edomite (and other Transjordanian) pottery of this age exhibits certain differences, probably because of influences emanating from Syria. The King's Highway orientated Edom culturally toward the north and south (Syria and Arabia) to a greater degree than other influences did toward Palestine.[3]

The language of Edom belonged to the west Semitic branch, being almost

---

1. M. E. Kirk, "An Outline of the Ancient Cultural History of Transjordan," PEQ, LXXVI (1944), 187.

2. Ibid., p. 189; Glueck, AASOR, XV (1934-35), 137.

3. Glueck, "The Civilization of Edom," BA, X (1947), 80.

identical with Hebrew. Unfortunately there are no extant evidences or examples of the literature of Edom, although it is a logical assumption that such a highly developed civilization produced literary material.[1] Because of other cultural similarities it is concluded that the Moabite Stone gives fair indication of the nature of the Edomite language.[2] In the excavation of Tell el-Kheleifeh Glueck discovered Edomite inscriptions on jars from Period IV,[3] described as "stamped with a royal seal." The characters were Edomite-Phoenician-Hebrew and read: "Belonging to Qosanal, the servant of the king."[4] Other inscribed discoveries included: on a small jug a late Edomite inscription perhaps to be read "belonging to Am . . . ,"[5] on fragments of jars (from Period III[6]) two South Arabic inscriptions in Minaean script,[7] and stamped impressions resembling a Byzantine cross, a Star of David, and a swastika.[1] Also discovered from Period III was a signet ring inscribed "belonging to YTM."[2] In period V a few Aramaic ostraca were found dating from the 4th century B.C.[3] Thus there is little evidence of the language of Edom, none of their literature.[4] Perhaps careful excavation of sites in Edom will eventu-

---

[1] M. E. Kirk, "An Outline of the Ancient Cultural History of Transjordan," PEQ, LXXVI (1944), 189, 190; Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan, p. 125.

[2] A. H. Van Zyl, The Moabites (volume III in "Pretoria Oriental Series," edited by A. Van Selms, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960), pp. 161-192; see also infra, pp. 30, 31.

[3] Period IV represents the late period of Edomite independence from the time of the breaking of Israelite control (under Ahaz) until the 6th century B.C.

[4] The inscription לקוסענל עבד המלך bears the name either Qosanal or Qosamal, Qos being the name of a god very popular in Nabataean times. The seal is interpreted as indicative of a royal official, perhaps a custom collector. The עבד may be read "officer" or "servant." The king is unidentified. (George Ernest Wright, "Qosanal, Servant of the King," BA, I (1938), 16; Glueck, "The Civilization of The Edomites," BA, X (1947), 83, 84.

[5] Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan, p. 110.

[6] Period III is the 8th century B.C. (Glueck, "The Third Season at Tell el-Kheleifeh," BASOR, LXXIX (1940), 12.

[7] This discovery is accepted as evidence that there was active trade with Arabia. (Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan, pp. 105-108.) Supplementary evidence of this trade may be seen in the discovery of an inscribed South

---

Arabian clay stamp from Bethel. (J. L. Kelso, "The Third Campaign at Bethel," BASOR, CLI (1958), 3-8; G. W. van Beek and A. Jamme, "An Inscribed South Arabian Clay Stamp from Bethel," BASOR, CLI (1958), 9-16.)

[1] Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan, pp. 108-110. The presence of the swastika here gives opportunity for some so-called "scholar" to connect the mutual hatred of Edom for Hebrews/Jews with the anti-Jewish feeling of the Third Reich and the common element, the swastika. However, the swastika seems to have been a world-wide symbol of good luck, of life, or of some religious significance. Cf. H.J.D. Astley, Biblical Anthropology (London: Oxford University Press, 1929), pp. 116-132; Zelia Nuttall, The Fundamental Principles of Old and New World Civilizations (Cambridge: Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, 1901), esp. pp. 544-548; W. Norman Brown, Swastika (New York: Emerson Books, 1933), pp. 1-30.

[2] Glueck, "The Third Season of Excavation at Tell el-Kheleifeh," BASOR, LXXIX (1940), 13-15, strongly suggests that this was Jotham, king of Judah; and in a footnote added by W. F. Albright, agreement is recorded with this identification, and Albright attempts to support it. One wonders why this startling discovery and its interpretation are subsequently ignored or forgotten by these authors.

[3] Ibid., p. 16. Period V is from the last of the 6th to the 4th centuries B.C.

[4] Writing in 1920, long before Glueck's discoveries, Eliezer Ben Yehudah spoke of the supposed dearth of Edomite writing: only a few names and places were known. Then he set forth the thesis that there is extant a bit of Edomite literature: that Proverbs 30:1-31:9 was written in the Edomite dialect. As a concluding note he suggested that Isaiah 21:11, 12 belongs to an Edomite dialect also. His study and suggestions are most interesting and suggestive. (Eliezer Ben Yehudah, "The Edomite Language," JPOS, I (1920), 113-115.) R. H. Pfeiffer has contended that one of the documents in Genesis, the "S" (South or Seir) source, is of Edomite origin. If this is true the "S" source presents Edomite literature redacted into Hebrew. (Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, pp. 159-167; Pfeiffer, "A Non-Israelitic Source of the Book of Genesis," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, N. F. VII (1930), 66-73.) Pfeiffer also contends that the book of Job originated as an Edomite folktale, adopted later into the Hebrew tradition and religion. Besides this, portions of Psalms and Proverbs

ally reveal inscriptional material of sufficient quantity to permit study of their language.

Of the religion of the Edomites very little is known. Although the Old Testament relates Yahweh with the land of Seir,[1] there is nothing to indicate that the inhabitants of Edom worshipped Yahweh. The probability is very strong that the Edomites worshipped the same fertility gods as did their neighbors. Glueck found near Buseirah (Bozrah) a 9th-8th century B.C. pottery figurine of a fertility goddess and concluded that this was a household-type image used by the Edomites.[2] Other similar and related figurines have been discovered, evidencing fertility cults.[3] There is a possibility that religious influence came from Egypt into Transjordan. A 12th century B.C. stele from Baluʿah depicts a Moabite god and goddess with an Egyptian headdress.[4] A logical assumption may be that similar influences were present in Edom. It has been supposed that the names of some Edomite deities are known: names with theophorous elements such as Hadad, Eliphaz, Reuel, Kaush (or Qos),

---

are considered to be from Edomite authors. (Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, pp. 621-623, 649, 650, 678-683; Pfeiffer, "Edomitic Wisdom," ZAW, XLIV (1926), 13-25.) In regard to Wisdom Literature, note is made here that one of the conclusions reached by Gold in his dissertation was that there is no significant evidence to support the often stated contention that there was an Edomite wisdom tradition. (Gold, "Studies in the History and Culture of Edom," esp. pp. 83, 84.) Agreement with Gold's conclusion is given by Albright, "Canaanite-Phoenician Sources of Hebrew Wisdom," Vetus Testamentum Supplement, III (1955), 4, 5, 13.

[1] This is probably traceable to the Kenite-Midianite worship of Yahweh. See supra, p. 27, fn. 1; Deuteronomy 33:2; Judges 5:4, 5; Habakkuk 3:3.

[2] Glueck, "The Civilization of the Edomites," BA, X (1947), 80.

[3] Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan, pp. 116, 117; Glueck, AASOR, XVIII-XIX (1937-1939), 32-37.

[4] M. E. Kirk, "An Outline of the Ancient Cultural History of Transjordan," PEQ, LXXVI (1944), 190.

Edom, Esau, and Ai;[1] but such has not been demonstrated beyond doubt.

The Kingdom of Edom: 1020-587 B.C.

Concerning the history of Edom from the 13th century B.C., after the accounts of the contact with the Hebrews in their period of wandering, there is silence in the Biblical account for a considerable period of time. Down to the time of Saul there is no evidence except the listing of the kings-chiefs in Genesis 36. Eight kings are listed who ruled Edom before the establishment of a monarchy in Israel (vv. 31-39); then eleven chiefs of Edom are enumerated (vv. 40-43). No chronology of any sort is supplied. Whatever is gathered from these lists relative to Edom's history is largely theoretical.[2]

From the period of the Hebrew monarchy relatively little evidence concerning the history of Edom comes from extra-Biblical sources. There are questionable references to excursions into Edom in the period of the 19th-20th dynasties from Egypt.[3] Shishak's expedition that took him into Jerusalem in the time of Rehoboam[1] took him also into Edom, which he claims in an inscription at Karnak to have overrun.[2] These evidences are interesting but cast little, if any, light upon the history of Edom. From the records of the Assyrian king, Adad-nirari III (810-783 B.C.), is the claim that he made expeditions to the west in 806, 805, and 797 B.C. in which tribute was received from, among other places, Edom. Edom is named by this monarch as a new conquest for the Kingdom of Assyria.[3] Tiglath-pileser III (744-727 B.C.), in an extant building inscription, relates that he received tribute from "Kaushmalaku [Qaushmalaku] of Edom" as well as from many other rulers and nations.[4] The "Broken Prism" of Sargon II (721-705 B.C.) records an attempted revolt in which Edom was involved.[5] According to the Oriental Institute Prism of Sennacherib (704-681 B.C.), in the same campaign (701 B.C.) in which he besieged Jerusalem, Aiarammu of Edom, among other rulers, "brought sumptuous gifts and--four-fold--their heavy tāmartu-presents to me and kissed my feet."[6] Esarhaddon (680-669 B.C.) claims to have forced "Qaushgabri," King

---

[1] G. L. Robinson, Sarcophagus, pp. 398, 399. Milik identifies Qôs as the principal deity of Edom and cites Edomite and Nabataean names with compounds of Qôs-Qaus. (J. T. Milik, "Nouvelles Inscriptions Nabateénnes," Syria, XXXV (1958), 236-241.

[2] Many theories have been set forth. Skinner notes that the list of kings bears every mark of authenticity, and he accepts it as accurate historical material. An average reign of twenty years per king is sometimes posited, dating the foundation of Edom's monarchy 150-200 years before David. According to the Genesis account this monarchy was not hereditary. It has been variously assumed that it was elective or that the practice of female succession was in vogue. Concerning the chiefs, the theory has been set forth that these are in reality the administrative districts of Edom under Israelite domination. (Skinner, ICC Genesis, pp. 434-437.)

[3] G. A. Frank Knight, Nile and Jordan (London: James Clarke and Company,

---

Ltd., 1921), pp. 233-241, 250, 254, 257. Dates for these rulers of the 19th and 20th dynasties are: Rameses II, 1292-1225 B.C.; Merneptah, 1225-1215 B.C.; Rameses III, 1198-1167 B.C. (James Henry Breasted, A History of Egypt from the Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest (2nd edition, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909), pp. 599, 600.

[1] I Kings 14:25, 26.

[2] Knight, Nile and Jordan, pp. 279, 280.

[3] R. W. Rogers, History of Babylonia and Assyria (2 vols., New York: Eaton and Mains, 1900), II, 96, 97. James B. Pritchard, editor, Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950), p. 281, col. 2 (hereafter referred to as ANET).

[4] Pritchard, ANET, p. 282, col. 1. Note that in the same list Jehoahaz of Judah is mentioned.

[5] Ibid., p. 287, col. 1. The revolt seems to have been against paying tribute, indicating that these nations had not been conquered as had Israel by this time.

[6] Ibid., p. 287, col. 2.

of Edom, with twenty-one other "kings of Hatti," to transport building materials to Nineveh.[1] Ashurbanipal (668-633 B.C.) records that he received tribute from Qaushgabri, King of Edom, who, with other kings, accompanied him (probably with their armies) in his attack on Egypt.[2]

Shortly after the beginning of the 6th century B.C. Edom was a participant in a revolt against Nebuchadrezzar,[3] the Babylonian Empire having then succeeded the Assyrian in world dominance. This rebellion of western states led to the 587 B.C. destruction of Jerusalem. Details of what befell Edom for its participation are lacking.[4] Robinson assumes that Edom's power was dealt a severe blow but that consequences were not as severe for Edom as for Judah in the way of destruction and deportation. He argues also that this fatal weakening of Edom set the stage for the Nabataean encroachment.[5]

The Biblical evidence concerning Edom in the period of the Hebrew monarchy relates that Saul fought against Edom,[6] but there is no evidence that this was more than a brief expedition against a harassing enemy neighbor.[7]

---

[1] Pritchard, ANET, p. 291, cols. 1, 2. Manasseh of Judah is one of the kings listed.

[2] Ibid., p. 294, cols. 1, 2. Manasseh of Judah is again listed.

[3] G. L. Robinson, Sarcophagus, pp. 364, 365; Jeremiah 27:1-11; Rogers, History of Babylonia and Assyria, II, 321 ff.

[4] Rogers, History of Babylonia and Assyria, II, 321-353, indicates by his omission of comment that there are no extant materials to give evidence of the fate of the participants (including Edom) in this rebellion other than Egypt, Judah, and Tyre.

[5] G. L. Robinson, Sarcophagus, pp. 364, 365. Such an assumption seems to go beyond the evidence; indeed, Edom may well have escaped the wrath of Nebuchadrezzar's army. Concerning this period of Edom's history additional archaeological evidence would be most valuable.

[6] I Samuel 14:47.

[7] An Edomite, Doeg, appears as a servant of Saul. He was the King's chief herdsman and was the murderer (at Saul's command) of the priests of Nob. (I Samuel 22:9-18)

David conquered the Kingdom of Edom, but details of the conquest are almost completely lacking. It is simply reported "he [David] slew eighteen thousand Edomites[1] in the Valley of Salt. And he put garrisons in Edom; throughout all Edom he put garrisons, and all the Edomites became David's servants."[2] For a period of six months after this initial battle, Joab and his army were engaged in establishing Israelite control of Edom: " . . . for Joab and all Israel remained there six months, until he had cut off every male in Edom."[3] Although there may have been a great slaughter, this is obviously a hyperbolic statement. Upon the deaths of David and Joab, Hadad, a royal prince who had escaped to Egypt in the time of David's conquest of Edom, returned, evidently seeking to raise the standard of revolt against Solomon. That he harassed Solomon is probable, but he never succeeded in throwing off Israelite domination.[4] That Solomon retained control of Edom during the entirety of his reign is evident from the account of his establishment of naval operations centered at Ezion-geber,[5] and from recognition that the first account of Edomite independence came in the time of Jehoram of Judah, when a successful revolt was carried out.[6]

---

[1] Emending the text with the Greek, ארם to אדם ; cf. I Chronicles 18:12, 13.

[2] II Samuel 8:13, 14. I Chronicles attributes the slaughter to Abishai, the son of Zeruiah (Joab), the general of David's army (18:12, 13).

[3] I Kings 11:15, 16.

[4] I Kings 11:14-25.

[5] I Kings 9:24-28, 10:11, 12.

[6] II Kings 8:20-22; II Chronicles 21:9, 10. Intervening references indicate that this was not the first revolt attempted (cf. II Chronicles 20). Other intervening references relate that in the time of Jehoshaphat, "There was no king in Edom; a deputy was king." (I Kings 22:47), that Jehoshaphat controlled Ezion-geber, the site of the disaster to his navy (I Kings 22:48), and that Edom aided Jehoshaphat of Judah and Jehoram of Israel in a campaign against Moab (II Kings 3:9).

For a considerable period of time after David's conquest of Edom, perhaps 200 years, the struggle continued between Edom and Israel-Judah for control of the land of Seir. The Hebrews held the upper hand from David to Jehoram, but there were continual attempts at rebellion by the Edomites. Glueck has set forth the idea that the fierceness of this struggle, which was mutually exhausting on both sides, was one of the contributing factors in the Edomite weakness that resulted in the subsequent disappearance of the Edomites as a separate ethnic and political group.[1] The desire of the Hebrews to control Edom may be traced to three important assets possessed by Edom: the trade routes it controlled, the Gulf of Aqabah seaport, and the natural resources, especially copper and iron, found in Edom but lacking in Palestine proper.

The King's Highway had long been an important route for trade. This route, extending from the Gulf of Aqabah to the northern border of Edom, through the Wadi Arabah, and further north through Transjordan to Syria, was already in existence in the 23rd-20th centuries B.C. It has continued to be the main route of land travel through the area to this day.[2] It must be understood that the Mediterranean sea lanes from Palestine were controlled by the Phoenicians. The Hebrews had no opening for naval adventures or seagoing commerce in the Mediterranean. David's subduing of Edom was motivated by much more than his desire to cut off at the source recurrent invasions into his own territory. He realized, according to Glueck, that the economic life line of Israel reached through the Negeb and the Arabah to the Red Sea. "This was fully understood and energetically acted upon by his son, Solomon, and by every strong occupant of the throne in Jerusalem after him."[1] This matter of keeping the way to Elath open became a cardinal principle of Israelite and Judaean policy; for this reason the struggle to control Edom continued. "They [the Hebrews] were forced by reason of their geographical position and the dominant topographical features of their land to face southward, with the same inevitableness that the sunflower is compelled constantly to turn its head toward the sun."[2] In all probability David and his successors were much interested in the copper and iron available in Edom, valuable trade commodities in the ancient, as well as in the modern, world. David probably began some exploitation of the mines, especially copper, in Edom after his conquest; but it was most likely Solomon who intensified the mining operations, perhaps to the extent of placing the mining industry of Edom on a national scale. The mines were probably worked by enslaved Edomites, and the Edomites before and after their enslavement may have worked these mines with slave labor.[3] The presence of ore and slag heaps in the Arabah region of Edom has been known for a century or more, but many of these sites were identified and described by Glueck in his explorations. Mining and smelting sites were discovered at Khirbet Hamr Ifdan, Khirbet en-Nahan, Khirbet el-Gheweibeh, Khirbet el-Jariyeh, Khirbet Nqeib, Aseimer, Feinan, Qair, Meneiyeh, and Khirbet es-Sabrah.[4] Such sites are present from about thirty kilometers south of the Dead Sea to the Gulf of Aqabah.[1] Glueck has concluded quite confidently that Ezion-geber (Tell el-Kheleifeh) was built by Solomon and served as a great refinery center for metals and for metal crafts he exported from this seaport site.[2]

---

[1] Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan, pp. 53, 54. Glueck does not say so, but the exhaustion incurred by Judah may well have contributed to its downfall under the Babylonians.

[2] Ibid., p. 15.

---

[1] Glueck, Rivers in the Desert, pp. 122, 123.

[2] Ibid., p. 123.

[3] Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan, pp. 84, 85. In this connection it is perhaps more than just interesting to note how often Edom is spoken of in connection with slaves and slavery in the Old Testament.

[4] Glueck, "The Recently Discovered Ore Deposits in Eastern Palestine," BASOR, LXIII (1936), 4-8; Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan, pp. 50-88; AASOR, XV (1934-1935), 1-142.

Rather drastic exception recently has been taken to the conclusions reached by Glueck, as sketched above. Beno Rothenberg and others conducted an archaeological survey of the western side of the Arabah in 1959-1960,[3] which, according to Rothenberg, demands considerable changes in the account given by Glueck.

> The exclusive 10th-9th century B.C. dating of the pottery from Wadi Timna and Wadi Amram, seen against the background of Biblical history, particularly of the Arabah, the Negev, and Edom, makes it historically reasonable to assume that the copper industries of the Wadi Arabah were established by King Solomon. The planning and maintaining of such large enterprises, problems of manpower, supply, defences, and the safeguarding of long lines of communication, demand the efforts of a strong monarch with ample supplies at his disposal. None but Israel's King Solomon seems to answer these requirements.
>
> The Iron Age copper industries of the western Arabah did not exist before the days of Solomon and did not function at any other period afterwards. No sign of exploitation of the mines or use of the smelting camps during the reign of the 8th-6th centuries Judaean Kings was found anywhere in the western Arabah.[4]

---

[1] Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan, p. 56.

[2] Ibid., pp. 89-113. Beno Rothenberg has argued with much cogency that Tell el-Kheleifeh was not a smelting refinery but a fortified caravanserai built by Solomon "(i) to guard the two approaches from the south (from both sides of the gulf); (ii) to serve as a central store of grain and other supplies for passing trade caravans and soldiers, and for the mining enterprises in the southern Arabah (most probably acquired in nearby Edom, as suggested by some Edomite sherds found in the store-rooms of Wadi Temna's smelters); (iii) to serve (especially since period II) as a caravanserai on the highly important incense route from Arabia to Egypt and Syria." Beno Rothenberg, "Ancient Copper Industries in the Western Arabah," PEQ, XCIV (1962), 56.

[3] Rothenberg, "Ancient Copper Industries in the Western Arabah," PEQ, XCIV (1962), 3.

[4] Ibid., p. 40.

The same author points out that, although there is evidence of constant repairs to the buildings at these various sites, the uniformity of the pottery suggests use of the sites over a limited period. The changes resulted from the temporary character of the structures.[1] Pottery fragments were not found at mining sites, suggesting semi-nomadic living for the miners; but the abundance of pottery at camps near smelting sites suggests that these camps may have been the dwellings for miners and smelters.[2] Rothenberg also takes issue with Glueck on the question of slave labor in the mining-smelting operations. He says, "We do not know whether the laborers were volunteers or forcibly drafted, but we know that there were no means whatsoever of forcibly detaining anyone at the mining sites."[3]

These copper mines, according to Rothenberg, functioned for only a few years. Instead of the rich copper trade supposedly engaged in by Solomon, based on the rich supplies from the Negeb and Edom, there was not enough to satisfy the large needs of Solomon's Temple.[4] This copper industry of Solomon's time is not mentioned in the Biblical record simply because it was not significant enough to deserve mention.[5] No evidence was found by the exploration led by Rothenberg of mining-refining-casting operations in the Negeb. The suggestion is made that the rough metal was sent to Israel's metallurgical center in the valley of Succoth.[6] As previously indicated, the analysis of Rothenberg is that Tell el-Kheleifeh was a fortified caravanserai rather than a refining and casting center for Arabah-produced metals.[1]

---

[1] Rothenberg, "Ancient Copper Industries in the Western Arabah," PEQ, XCIV (1962), 40.

[2] Ibid., p. 41.

[3] Ibid.

[4] I Kings 7:14-47; II Chronicles 4:16-18.

[5] Rothenberg, "Ancient Copper Industries in the Western Arabah," PEQ, XCIV (1962), 42.

[6] Ibid., p. 43; I Kings 7:46.

After Solomon's death Edom remained under the control of Judah, though references are lacking relative to this control until the time of Jehoshaphat, and these references are not above question.[2] The MT says that Jehoshaphat ruled through a deputy governor[3] and that he had a fleet built to reactivate maritime trade by way of the Red Sea from Elath, but his fleet was wrecked on rocks near Ezion-geber.[4] It was near the end of his reign that some Edomites joined with other enemies of Judah for a raid on En-gedi.[5] During the reign of Jehoram of Judah the Edomites successfully revolted[6] but were again subdued partially by Amaziah of Judah, who captured Sela and changed its name to Joktheel.[7] Amaziah's son, Uzziah, pursued to a successful conclusion the attack upon Edom, even capturing Elath.[8] Glueck equates the marked rise in prosperity and peace in Uzziah's time with the control of Edom and the wealth received therefrom.[9] It was in the time of Ahaz that Judah's control of Edom was permanently broken,[10] with a weakened Edom, never again to regain her former splendor,[1] retaining some measure of independence until the Maccabaean period. While Ahaz was king the Edomites were making raids upon Judah for the acquisition of slaves, with the result that Ahaz appealed to Assyria.[2] The appearance of Tiglath-pileser III restored the precarious situation: the Assyrian monarch conquered Syria and received recognition of Assyrian dominance from the regions to the south.[3] Heavy tribute was burdensome; and Edom, along with other states (but not Judah at this time), was encouraged into revolt by Egypt. This revolt was easily subdued by Sargon II.[4]

---

[1] Rothenberg, "Ancient Copper Industries in the Western Arabah," PEQ, XCIV (1962), 44 ff.; cf. supra, p. 38, fn. 2.

[2] II Kings 22:47-50 are not found in LXX MSS except in Codex A, and there in slightly altered form.

[3] The reference to the "deputy" is quite uncertain. It is not clear as to whether this was Jehoshaphat's deputy or simply an Edomite of non-royal blood.

[4] I Kings 22:48, 49. Codex A of the LXX says only one ship.

[5] II Chronicles 20:1-30.

[6] II Kings 8:20-22.

[7] II Kings 14:7; II Chronicles 25:11, 12.

[8] II Kings 14:22; II Chronicles 26:1, 2.

[9] Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan, p. 87.

[10] II Kings 16:5, 6, accepting emendations in v. 6, omitting "Rezin" and changing "Aram" to "Edom."

The Biblical records, as well as secular records, maintain almost complete silence concerning the role of Edom following the decline of the Assyrian Empire. Concerning what was happening with regard to Edom in the time of the fall of Nineveh, the death of Josiah at Megiddo, and the defeat of Necho at Carchemish by Nebuchadrezzar, nothing is recorded. Jehoiakim had, meanwhile, begun to reign in Judah about 608 B.C., placed on the throne by Necho of Egypt.[5] He became a vassal of Nebuchadrezzar about the year 601 B.C. It seems that Nebuchadrezzar was busy elsewhere when, after three years of vassalage, Jehoiakim rebelled.[6] But he employed Edomites,[7] Ammonites, and

---

[1] Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan, p. 87. Although Glueck makes much of the weakened and impoverished condition of Edom in this period, he admits at another point that Edom must have been in good condition compared with Judah. Under Esarhaddon Edom paid in tribute twelve minas of silver; Judah, only ten (p. 128).

[2] II Chronicles 28:16, 17.

[3] G. L. Robinson, Sarcophagus, pp. 360, 361. Robinson mistakenly calls the ruler Tiglath-pileser IV.

[4] Ibid., p. 364. [5] II Kings 23:34. [6] II Kings 24:1.

[7] II Kings 24:2, accepting the reading of the Syriac, "Edom" for "Aram." See H. Wheeler Robinson, The History of Israel ("Studies in Theology," edited by Nathaniel Micklem, London: Gerald Duckworth and Company, 1938), p. 126, and supra, p. 3, fn. 3.

Moabites along with Chaldaean troops, perhaps his own garrisons in Syria, to harass the city of Jerusalem. Jehoiachin had succeeded his father as king of Judah when Nebuchadrezzar arrived on the scene to lay siege to the city. Jehoiachin surrendered the city in 597 B.C. upon the arrival of Nebuchadrezzar, and the first deportation from Jerusalem-Judah followed.[1] Peace and subjection to Babylon followed for a brief time. But tribute was tiresome and chafing, and soon trouble was brewing again. Edom along with Ammon, Moab, Tyre, Sidon, and Judah plotted a revolt against their Babylonian overlord. This revolt failed to materialize, perhaps because of the influence of Jeremiah,[2] or because of the discovery that Egypt would not join them, or because Nebuchadrezzar heard of their plans and took prompt measures to forestall the revolt,[3] or perhaps because the conspirators could not agree among themselves.

As to the part played by Edom and the effect of the circumstances in Palestine on Edom in the 587 B.C. destruction of Jerusalem, the historical records--Biblical and non-Biblical--are silent. Assumptions are recorded ranging from one extreme to the other. G. L. Robinson says that the effective end of Edom as a national kingdom came as a result of the 6th century B.C. alliance with Judah and other neighboring nations against Nebuchadrezzar of Babylon. He argues that Edom was conquered in 587 B.C. and that some Edomites were deported from their homeland, but most remained in Edom.[4] On the other hand, W. F. Lofthouse contends that Edomites were among the troops used by Nebuchadrezzar in this destruction of Jerusalem and that the callous attitude of these Edomites brought forth the undying hatred of their beleaguered kinsmen.[1] Whatever the involvement (or lack of it) of Edom in the events of 587 B.C., she remained not strong enough to effectively resist the surging desert tribes on the move from Arabia. In the years after the destruction of Jerusalem, with Edom in a weakened state, Nabataean nomads moved in and took over the land of Edom.[2]

---

[1] II Kings 24:6-17.

[2] Jeremiah 27:4-11.

[3] W. O. E. Oesterley and Theodore H. Robinson, A History of Israel (2 volumes, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932), I, 438.

[4] G. L. Robinson, Sarcophagus, p. 364.

The discovery of three Aramaic-inscribed vessels at Tell el-Maskhuta in Lower Egypt may shed some additional illumination on the problem of the dating of the Nabataèan invasion of Edom. These vessels are from a shrine of "han-ʾIlat," a goddess commonly worshipped in the pre-Islamic North-Arab world.[3] Significant for this discussion is the inscription which reads:

די קינו בר גשם מלך קדר קרב להנאלת

"That-which Qainū bar Gešem, king of Qēdār, brought-in-offering to han-ʿIlat."[4] The name of the goddess corresponds to that recorded by Herodotus:[5] ʼΑλιλάτ , equal to Aphrodite. The Arabs represented in this inscription were Qedar bedouin who may have been east of Ammon; the Arabs represented in Herodotus were probably further west.[1] Perhaps these also controlled some Mediterranean seaports. Toynbee suggests that Arabia, "which in 401 B.C. thus extended across the middle course of the Euphrates into the desert and steppe country of South-Eastern Mesopotamia according to Xenophon, also extended, according to Herodotus [3:5], to the shores of the Mediterranean at the south-east corner of that sea."[2] Toynbee concludes that this territory was ceded to the Arabs from Syrian territory by the Persians to give the Arabs an outlet on the sea as a reward for services rendered by the Arabs in assisting Cambyses when he crossed the desert to invade Egypt.[3]

---

[1] W. F. Lofthouse, *Israel After the Exile* ("The Clarendon Bible, Old Testament," volume IV, edited by Bishop Strong, Bishop Wild, and Canon G. H. Box, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1928), p. 100.

[2] There is little evidence upon which to base conclusions relative to the Edomite settlement of the Negeb. Josephus (*Antiquities* x, 9, 181 f.) relates that in 582 B.C., Nebuchadrezzar made war on and subjugated Ammon and Moab; no mention is made of Edom (cf. Martin Noth, *History of Israel*, translated by P. R. Ackroyd (London: A. and C. Black, 1960), pp. 293, 294). At the time of the writing of Ezekiel 35 the Edomites were in part of Judah. The most conclusive evidence is that this Edomite migration into the Negeb took place between 587 B.C. and 312 B.C., for in this latter year the Nabataeans were in control of Petra. (Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca Historica*, xix, 94.)

[3] Isaac Rabinowitz, "Aramaic Inscriptions of the Fifth Century B.C.E. from a North-Arab Shrine in Egypt," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, XV (1956), 2, 3.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

[5] iii:8.

It is entirely possible, and is suggested as highly likely, that these Arabs were in some way involved in the Nabataean influx which forced the Edomites into Idumaea. Coins found at the shrine of Tell el-Maskhuta can be dated as to mintage from the 5th to the first quarter of the 4th centuries B.C.[4] The bowls and their inscriptions must be of not much later date--probably no later than late 5th to early 4th centuries B.C., a dating which is also supported by the paleography of the inscriptions.[5] Rabinowitz argues, with some plausibility but without conclusive evidence, that the Gešem of the bowl inscription is the same person as the Geshem (or Gashmu), the Arabian, of the book of Nehemiah,[6] dating his floruit ca. 440 B.C.[7]

---

[1] Rabinowitz, "Aramaic Inscriptions," JNES, XV (1956), 3.

[2] Arnold Toynbee, A Study of History (12 volumes, London: Oxford University Press, 1934-1961), III, 658.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Rabinowitz, "Aramaic Inscriptions," JNES, XV (1956), 4.

[5] Ibid., p. 6.

[6] Nehemiah 2:19, 6:1, 2, 6.

[7] Rabinowitz, "Aramaic Inscriptions," JNES, XV (1956), 6.

The friendship of these Qedarite Arabs with the Persians could easily suggest how they, and perhaps related tribes, were responsible for the initial pressure which ultimately caused the Edomites to move into the Negeb of Palestine, probably no later than in the 5th century B.C. The testimony of Herodotus[1] is that Cambyses conquered Egypt (525 B.C.) with the aid of Arabs. Probably these were of the same Qedarite group who left the recently discovered silver bowls. Enjoying the friendship of the conquerors, they or kindred tribes could easily have caused pressure on the Nabataeans who pushed into Edom, gradually taking over and pushing the Edomites further west. The Arab shrine and settlement at Tell el-Maskhuta probably did not survive the end of Persian rule over Egypt at the end of the 5th century B.C.;[2] and these Arabs, seeking new homes, may well have contributed to the push against the Edomites which resulted in the loss of their land. The conclusion is not substantiated irrefutably but is suggested that this movement of the Qedarite Arabs in the late 6th to 5th centuries B.C. gives evidence upon which to date the Nabataean invasion of Edom.

Some of the Edomites in the time of this invasion were absorbed by the Nabataeans; others emigrated to southern Judah and the Negeb south of Judah. The Nabataeans built a remarkable civilization of their own in Edom, higher and grander than that of the Edomites. The wonders of Petra today stand as a monument of their civilization. Their apogee came in the period from the 2nd century B.C. to the 2nd century A.D. The displaced Edomites, now in southern Judah, are known as Idumaeans,[3] at least from the time of

---

[1] iii:88.

[2] Rabinowitz, "Aramaic Inscriptions," JNES, XV (1956), 9.

[3] Glueck, Rivers in the Desert, p. 12.

Alexander the Great.

The Idumaeans

There is little evidence upon which to base a reconstruction of the history of these displaced Edomites down to 164 B.C. In all probability the territory of southern Judah was virtually uninhabited when the Edomites arrived, and they simply settled on it and claimed it. References in the prophets in the anti-Edom oracles are sometimes cited as evidence for this movement and its date,[1] but such use of these passages must be avoided unless quite accurate dates can be established. The viewpoint set forth by Buhl,[2] along with a few others,[3] that the Edomites were forced, after a brief period in southern Judah, at the hands of the Persians to hand over their newly occupied territory to the Jews, but that later in the Persian period they reoccupied Idumaea permanently, is correctly labeled by Torrey as "a conjecture . . . without external support or intrinsic probability."[4] It must be concluded that when the Edomites came to southern Judah they remained.

Idumaea is mentioned in the texts of several classical authors[5] but with little detail useful in the reconstruction of its history. The Old

---

[1] G. L. Robinson, Sarcophagus, pp. 366-368; C. C. Torrey, "The Edomites in Southern Judah," JBL, XVII (1898), 16-20.

[2] Buhl, Geschichte, pp. 77, 78. Buhl claims Malachi 1:1-5 as evidence that at the time of its writing, the Edomites were in their old homeland (p.78).

[3] Torrey lists Smend, Stade, and Herzfeld (Torrey, "The Edomites in Southern Judah," JBL, XVII (1898), 19).

[4] Ibid.

[5] Diodorus Siculus, Bibliotheca Historica xix:95, 98; Pliny the Elder, Natural History, V:xiv; Strabo, Geography XVI:ii:2; Claudius Ptolemaeus, Geography v:16:10.

Testament Apocryphal books, especially I Maccabees, and Josephus are the major sources for this period. In the absence of evidence indicating otherwise, it is assumed that the Jews and Idumaeans existed side by side without major difficulty[1] until the time of the Maccabaean Revolt. Josephus[2] and I Maccabees[3] relate the exploits of Judas Maccabaeus against the Idumaeans.[4] The Idumaeans were completely conquered by John Hyrcanus.[5] The account of Josephus is as follows:

> Hyrcanus . . . , after subduing all the Idumaeans, permitted them to remain in their country so long as they had themselves circumcised and were willing to observe the laws of the Jews. And so, out of attachment to the land of their fathers, they submitted to circumcision and to making their manner of life conform in all other respects to that of the Jews. And from that time on they have continued to be Jews.[6]

The Idumaeans henceforth were technically a part of the Jewish people. Well known is the story of the rise of the hated Idumaeans, Antipater and his family, to power over the Jews under the Roman Empire. The end of Idumaea came with the 70 A.D. destruction of Judaea and Jerusalem by Vespasian and Titus; but in their going from the course of human history, they struck a Samson-like blow at the related but genuinely hated Jews. In the course of the war with Rome there was a considerable struggle within the factions of the Jews. In Jerusalem there was a struggle between the Zealots and the more moderate Jews for control of the city and concerning the policy to be followed in the war. The Zealots invited the Idumaeans to aid them in Jerusalem and succeeded in getting them into the city (seemingly the Romans did not object). The

---

[1] Julian Morgenstern has other ideas; these are discussed fully in Chapter III of this dissertation.

[2] Antiquities xii:8:327-329.

[3] I Maccabees 5:1-8, 65.

[4] Ca. 164 B.C.

[5] 135-105 B.C.

[6] Antiquities xiii:9:257, 258.

Idumaeans, together with the Zealots, accomplished a great slaughter among the Jews: according to Josephus, in one day in the Temple area alone eight thousand five hundred were killed. After this massacre they went about the city killing Jewish leaders and common people, until of these twelve thousand lay dead and unburied in Jerusalem. After tiring of killing at random, tribunals were set up to put others to death in a slightly different mode. Finally the Idumaeans are said to have repented of having come to the city and of having done what they had done; then they went to their homes.[1] With the successful conclusion of the Roman campaign, the Edomites/Idumaeans are known to history no more. "Edom" continues, however, as a symbolic designation of the enemy, such as it had become even in late Old Testament times.[2]

---

1. *Wars* iv:4:225-iv:6:353.

2. See *infra*, Chapter II, pp. 94-95; Yigael Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness*, translated by Batya and Chaim Rabin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 24, 25. For the Talmudic use of Edom as a designation for Rome see especially in the Babylonian Talmud Sanhedrin, 12a, 94a, Pesahim, 87b. In many other places in the Talmud "Edom" is similarly used. *The Babylonian Talmud*, edited by I. Epstein (in 35 volumes, London: The Soncino Press, 1935-1952); see especially the Index Volume.

Chapter II

AN EXAMINATION OF OLD TESTAMENT PASSAGES EXPRESSING AN ANTI-EDOM BIAS

Introduction

Edom and the Edomites are often mentioned in the Old Testament, usually in words of hatred, bitterness, or condemnation. In truth, there is hardly a kind word for Edom to be found in the entire Old Testament.

There are four primary relationships in which Edom is mentioned in the Old Testament: (1) the aetiological legends concerning her origin and kinship with Israel, (2) the Israelite-Edomite contact in the wilderness after the Exodus, (3) the accounts of periodic subjugation and control of Edom by Israel or Judah in the period of the monarchy, and (4) the later attitude of hatred for Edom on the part of the Jews. Other scattered references to these brother-neighbors of Israel certainly exist but offer little to aid an understanding of the relationships and attitudes between these nations. The fourth of the above enumerated relationships is that which is of major concern here. The prior ones are basically historical in nature and importance.

That there was an attitude of hatred, certainly a biased attitude, toward Edom in the Old Testament cannot be overlooked. To attempt to explain the hatred between these nations by such statements as " . . . Edom was never to forgive the sons of Jacob for the dish of lentils refused to Esau . . ."[1] is the epitome of naïveté, but the suspicion remains that just such an explanation for this hostility is uncritically accepted by many students of the Old Testament. Perhaps the Genesis stories of Jacob and Esau are venerable traditional material seized upon and inserted in the Pentateuch by a post-Exilic editor seeking to give to the anti-Edom feeling the respectable aura of antiquity--to say nothing of the impetus provided such a feeling by proclaiming this hatred in keeping with the spirit of the "fathers." Or perhaps these are simply ancient stories reflecting age-old conflict and animosity between peoples. For the purposes of this study, then, the aetiological legends of Esau-Edom in Genesis, the contacts, with tones of unbrotherliness, between Edom and Israel during the latter's trek from Egypt to the Promised Land, and the subjugation of Edom by David and his successors--all these are accepted as little more than background material for the mutual hatred that developed between Israel and Edom.[2]

One characteristic of the prophetic message in Israel after 587 B.C. was a "Damn-Edom" theology.[3] A cursory reading of post-Exilic Biblical material will demonstrate that Edom was hated with an exceedingly fierce hatred. From all indications the Edomites reciprocated with hatred in approximately the same degree of intensity. It is unfortunate that an account of only one side of this anger and conflict is extant. The Edomite point of view would undoubtedly be interesting and might cast significant light on the Palestinian situation of the sixth and following centuries.

---

[1] Henri Daniel-Rops, Israel and the Ancient World, translated by K. Madge (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1949), p. 110.

[2] The Edomite genealogy of Genesis 36 and I Chronicles 1 is just that, having no essential bearing upon the thesis discussed herein.

[3] William Franklin Stinespring, class notes, Old Testament 310, Duke University, Spring, 1961. Dr. Stinespring points out, and the writer gives assent to this explanation, that "Damn-Edom" is not meant in a profane sense, but is to be taken theologically in its basic meaning.

The Book of Obadiah

The most forthright and unmistakable expression of "Damn-Edom" theology is found in the book of Obadiah. This, the shortest book in the canon of the Old Testament, has received more attention from Christian exegetes who have sought to justify its existence in the canon and have attempted to glean some moral or spiritual value therefrom than from those who have tried to understand its message and background. Most writing devoted to Obadiah's "Hymn of Hate,"[1] has been on the relationship between Obadiah and Jeremiah 49. Such matters are of undoubted importance but are peripheral to the interpretation of the prophetic message.

Authorship. The author of this oracle remains one of the many unknowns of Hebrew literary history. Obadiah may be a proper noun,[2] or it may be a title, "worshipper of Yahweh."[3] Bewer correctly observes that "We cannot characterize Obadiah from the few verses we have from him."[1] He then attempts what he said could not be done:

---

[1] 1. Clyde T. Francisco, Introducing the Old Testament (Nashville: The Broadman Press, 1950), p. 88.

[2] 2. This common name is ascribed to some eleven men, other than the prophet, in the Old Testament, but none can be identified as the author of this oracle. Listings of those bearing this name are found in: G. W. Wade, The Books of the Prophets Micah, Obadiah, Joel, and Jonah ("Westminster Commentaries," edited by Walter Locke, London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1925), p. xxxii, fn. 1, and E. R. Achtemeier, "Obadiah," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, 4 volumes, edited by G. A. Buttrick, New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), III, 577, 578.

[3] 3. The Hebrew name is Obadiah; it is rendered into Greek as Obdias or Abdias, into Latin as Abdias. The meaning is Worshipper or Servant of

> . . . we are aware that his strong way of putting things, his graphic descriptions, his love for striking pictures, his quick exclamations, his impassioned warnings throbbing with anger and sorrow, made all aglow by a wonderfully vivid imagination, reveal a strong, passionate nature uncurbed by prophetic discipline and experience.[2]

While such observations may be justified, an analysis of the prophet must end with the statement that he hated Edom.[3]

Position in the canon. The location of the book itself in the canon is of very little assistance in understanding its message. In the Hebrew canon Obadiah is one of the Scroll of the Twelve, following Amos. The relationship upon which this order is based is not clear. Whether the editor based his arrangement on the common denunciation of Edom[4] or on the teaching of the Day of Yahweh[5] cannot be certainly ascertained. Perhaps the mention of Edom in Amos 9:12 provided the key for placing Obadiah next in order of arrangement. The LXX arrangement places Obadiah after Joel. This may be justified on the basis that there are close relationships of thought between various passages in the two books.[6] In both Hebrew and Greek arrangements

---

Yahweh. BDB, pp. 714, 715; Julius Bewer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Obadiah and Joel ("International Critical Commentary," edited by C. A. Briggs, S. R. Driver, and Alfred Plummer, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911), p. 13, and Wade, WC Obadiah, p. xxxii.

[1] Bewer, ICC Obadiah, p. 13.

[2] Ibid.

[3] And conversely, that he loved Israel (verses 19-21).

[4] Amos 1:11; Obadiah 1-14; Amos 9:12; Obadiah 19.

[5] Amos 5:18-20, etc.; Obadiah 15 ff.

[6] Obadiah 11; Joel 3:3. Obadiah 15a; Joel 1:15. Obadiah 15c; Joel 3:4. Obadiah 17a; Joel 2:32. Obadiah 17b; Joel 3:17. See also H.C.O. Lanchester, Obadiah and Jonah ("The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges," edited by A. F. Kirkpatrick, Cambridge: The University Press, 1918), p. 15.

Jonah follows Obadiah. Little more than a suggestion can be attempted as to why. The closest connection between these two seems to be Obadiah 1b, "A messenger has been sent among the nations," and the account of Jonah's mission as a messenger to one of the nations. Beyond this one strained attempt to show relationship, the two books are representative of opposing viewpoints in post-Exilic Judaism.

Unity and date. The brevity of the book of Obadiah would seem to point to a logical assumption of the unity of the book. However, an analysis of content may point in another direction. There is, in usual analyses, a very obvious break in subject at verse 15. The initial portion (1-14) is an oracle condemning Edom for cruel and unbrotherly conduct and speaking of the ensuing punishment that either has befallen, is befalling, or will befall her people. The final section (15-21) speaks of judgment that is to come upon all nations and especially on Edom, which shall be utterly wiped out.

Various views have been taken concerning the unity as well as the date of Obadiah in the history of its interpretation. A selective sampling of varying conclusions dealing with the twin problems of the unity and the date of writing is deemed valuable here. Eichhorn (1824) dated 1-16 as Exilic and 17-21 as an appendix from the time of Alexander Jannaeus (106-80 B.C.).[1] Ewald (1868) dated 1-10 as contemporary with Isaiah of Jerusalem, 15-18 as an earlier prophecy, and 11-14, 19-21 as an addition by a prophet of the Exile who combined his work with the two earlier passages.[2] Wellhausen (1892) explained most of 1-14, 15b as a prophecy of Obadiah, a post-Exilic prophet who followed Malachi, with 15a, 16-21 as a later appendix.[3] S. R. Driver (1902) accepted

---

[1] Bewer, ICC Obadiah, p. 5; Lanchester, CB Obadiah, p. 11.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

1-9 as an older prophecy, 10-14 as coming from the period of the fall of Jerusalem, as does the section 15-21.[1] Barton (1905) identified 1-6 as a pre-Exilic oracle of Obadiah, 7-15 as a prophecy of another Obadiah early in the Exile, and 16-21 as an appendix from Maccabaean times.[2] Julius Bewer (1912) explained 1-4 as a pre-Exilic oracle against Edom, 5-14, 15b as a writing by Obadiah early in the 5th century B.C. to hail the Nabataean invasion of Edom as a fulfillment of this earlier prophecy, and 15a, 16-21 as an appendix from about a century later relating the judgment on Edom to the "Day of Yahweh."[3] Lanchester (1918) contended that 1-7, 10-14 were written soon after 587 B.C. (but 1-6 was taken from an earlier prophecy); 8, 9, 15-21 were most likely written during the Exile, but later than the first section.[4] G. W. Wade (1925) divided and dated Obadiah in this way: 1-5 was pre-Exilic (8th century B.C. ?), 6-14, 15b came from the middle of the 5th century B.C., and 15a, 16-21 date from the last half of the 5th century B.C.[5] Rudolph (1931) suggests that 1-14, 15b were written before 587 B.C.; that 15a, 16-18 were written later but by the same prophet, and that 19-21 were added much later near Maccabaean times.[6] Theodore H. Robinson (1938) analyzed Obadiah into seven fragments dating from between the end of the 6th century B.C. and the middle of the 4th century B.C. The final redaction of the book he placed in the last half of the 4th century B.C.[1] Lucien Gautier argued that Obadiah should be considered basically a unity from the 6th century B.C., granting that minor redactional work took place later.[2] Robert H. Pfeiffer (1941 and 1948) wrote that 1-14, 15b were to be dated a little before or after 460 B.C., 15a must be accepted as a title to the second part of the book, 16-18 date from about 400 B.C., and 19-21 come from the first part of the 4th century B.C.[3] Artur Weiser (1949) concludes that 1-14, 15b is a homogeneous oracle from the period after 587 B.C.; 15a, 16-21 does not arise out of the same situation as 1-14, 15b, but he argues that it is not necessary to assume another author.[4] Adolphe Lods (1950) considers Obadiah a post-Exilic prophecy, dated ca. 400 B.C., in which the author used and adapted the pre-Exilic oracle on Edom in Jeremiah 49.[5] P. Meinrad Schumpp (1950) divides the oracle of Obadiah at verse 10: 1-10, "Urobadjah," is pre-Exilic; 11-21 is post-Exilic.[6] H. H. Rowley (1950) shows a tendency to consider the oracle as a unity written by a prophet of the Exilic period living in Palestine.[1] Miloš Bič (1953) interprets Obadiah as a-historical, relating it to the cult. It is a "historical cult drama" depicting the enthronement of Yahweh, coming from ancient times.[2] Trinquet (1953) interprets Obadiah in two parts: 1-7, 10-14, 15cd are dated from 550-450 B.C.; 8, 9, 15ab, 16-21 are a separate section from somewhere between 400 and 200 B.C.[3] André Neher (1955) dates Obadiah's prophecy from the 7th century B.C., giving no comment concerning the unity of the book.[4] John A. Thompson (1956) defends the unity of Obadiah, accepting the use of an earlier oracle in verses 1-9. The composition of the book is dated in the middle of the 5th century B.C.[5] Otto Eissfeldt (1956) divides the book into two sections, 1-14, 15b reflecting the events of 587 B.C., 15a, 16-21 from later times, dated in relation to Joel and Isaiah 13.[6] Aage Bentzen (1957) is hesitant to express

---

[1] Samuel Rolles Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (10th edition, "International Theological Library," edited by Charles A. Briggs and Stewart D. F. Salmond, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902), pp. 318-321.

[2] G. A. Barton, "Obadiah," Jewish Encyclopedia (edited by Isidore Singer, New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1905), vol. IX, 369, 370.

[3] Bewer, ICC Obadiah, pp. 3-17.

[4] Lanchester, CB Obadiah, pp. 11-20.

[5] Wade, WC Obadiah, pp. xxxviii-xliii.

[6] W. Rudolph, "Obadja," ZAW, XLIX (1931), 222-231.

---

[1] Theodore H. Robinson and F. Horst, *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten* ("Handbuch zum Alten Testament," edited by Eissfeldt, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1938), pp. 109-116.

[2] Lucien Gautier, *Introduction à L'Ancien Testament* (3rd edition, in 2 volumes, Lausanne: Librairie Payot, 1939), I, 409.

[3] Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, pp. 584-586 (in both the 1941 and 1948 editions).

[4] Artur Weiser, *Das Buch der Zwölf Kleinen Propheten, I, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadjah, Jona, Micha* ("Das Alte Testament Deutsch," volume 24, edited by Herntrich and Weiser, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949), pp. 206-207; Weiser, *The Old Testament, Its Formation and Growth*, translated by Dorothea M. Barton (New York: Association Press, 1961), pp. 248, 249.

[5] Adolphe Lods, *Histoire de la Littérature Hébraïque et Juive Des Origines à la Ruine de l'Etat Juif* (135 Après J.-C.), (Paris: Payot, 1950), pp. 519-521; Lods, *The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism*, translated by S. H. Hooke ("The History of Civilization," edited by C. K. Ogden, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1937), p. 9.

[6] P. Meinrad Schumpp, *Das Buch der Zwölf Propheten* ("Die Heilige

---

Schrift," edited by Edmund Kalt and Willibald Lauck, Band X/2, Frieburg: Verlag Herder, 1950), pp. 149, 150.

1. Harold Henry Rowley, *The Growth of the Old Testament* ("Hutchinson's University Library, Christian Religion," edited by E. O. James, London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1950), p. 113.

2. Miloš Bič, "Zur Problematik des Buches Obadjah," *Supplement to Vetus Testamentum*, volume I, Congress Volume, Copenhagen, 1953 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953), pp. 11, 15-19.

3. J. Trinquet, *Habaquq, Abdias, Joël* ("La Sainte Bible," edited by M. Delcor and E. Osty, Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1953), pp. 48, 49.

4. André Neher, *L'Essence du Prophétisme* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1955), p. 6.

5. John A. Thompson, "The Book of Obadiah, Introduction and Exegesis," (*The Interpreter's Bible*, edited by G. A. Buttrick, in 12 volumes, New York: The Abingdon Press, 1956), VI, 858, 859.

6. Otto Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* ("Neue Theologische Grundrisse," edited by Rudolf Bultmann, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1956), pp. 490-493.

an opinion on either the date or the unity of Obadiah. "The unity of the book is disputed"; the book consists of "prophecies" against Edom. He very cautiously dates the book "to the time between 587, the fall of Jerusalem, and 312. . . ."[1] T. Henshaw (1958) refuses to say more than that 1-14, 15b is of mid-5th century B.C. date, and concerning 15a, 16-21 that "the date of their composition cannot be determined with precision but they are probably later than vv. 1-14, 15b."[2] Th. C. Vreizen (1958) seems to consider Obadiah a unity from the time immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem in 587 B.C.[3] Jacob M. Meyers (1959) dates 1-14, 15b soon after 587 B.C. and 15a, 16-21 sometime later in the same century.[4] G. W. Anderson (1959) accepts the book of Obadiah as a unity from the period of the Exile.[5] Curt Kuhl (1960) dates the substance of the foreign nation oracle on Edom in Obadiah 1-9 (and Jeremiah 49:7-22) from the time of Joram of Judah (849-842 B.C.) when the Edomites won their freedom from Judah. Verses 10-14, 15b he dates from shortly after 587 B.C. The section containing 15a, 16-18 is post-Exilic and is related to Joel, while 19-21 "probably dates to a later period."[6]

---

[1] Aage Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament (3rd edition, 2 volumes in 1, Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad, 1957), II, 143, 144.

[2] T. Henshaw, The Latter Prophets (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1958), pp. 266-269.

[3] Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, translated by S. Neuijen (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958), p. 64.

[4] Jacob M. Myers, The Books of Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, and Jonah ("Layman's Bible Commentary," edited by B. H. Kelly, volume XIV, Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959), pp. 150, 151.

[5] G. W. Anderson, A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament ("Studies in Theology," edited by Nathaniel Micklem, London: Gerald Duckworth and Company, Ltd., 1959), pp. 151, 152.

[6] Curt Kuhl, The Prophets of Israel, translated by Rudolf J. Ehrlich and J. P. Smith (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1960), pp. 57, 136, 137, 177.

Johannes Lindblom (1962) shows some uncertainty but considers Obadiah as a seemingly homogeneous composition from the post-Exilic period. He notes that verses 19-21 may be redactional rather than a genuine part of the prophecy.[1] James Muilenburg (1962) is also quite hesitant in making definite statements concerning the unity and date of Obadiah, but his arguments tend more toward the unity of the book, dating it from shortly after 587 B.C.[2]

It is interesting to note from this survey of opinions concerning the date and the unity of Obadiah that many are extremely hesitant about unequivocally stating an opinion. This can be traced, most likely, to the small interest in and lack of serious work on the book of Obadiah. Of some significance also may be the trend in recent scholarship to argue for the basic unity of the book, granting the use of the older oracle in verses 1-9 (that held in common with Jeremiah 49) and the possibility (or even probability) that verses 19-21 are a late addition to the original book.

The history of the critical interpretation of Obadiah shows viewpoints varying all the way from extreme fragmentation to claims of unity, with many varying shades between these two poles. A middle way appears to be demanded by a careful study of this prophecy. Verses 1-14 stand as a logical unity. There is no good reason demanding a division of this section except the material held in common by Obadiah and Jeremiah. This relationship is to be discussed more fully in a following section. The author of Obadiah probably incorporated portions of an older "Damn-Edom" oracle into his prophetic message. The dating of Obadiah 1-14 shortly after the fall of Jerusalem would point to a conclusion that this oracle used by Obadiah was pre-Exilic; but if Obadiah 1-14 is dated later, an Exilic or post-Exilic date for this oracle would be quite possible.

---

[1] Johannes Lindblom, Prophecy in Ancient Israel (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962), pp. 227, 278.

[2] James Muilenburg, "Book of Obadiah," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (edited by G. A. Buttrick, in 4 volumes, New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), III, 678, 679.

The emphasis turns in 15-21 from "may Edom be damned" to "may all the nations--and especially Edom--be damned while Judah is to be blessed." The theme is the Day of Yahweh, with doom for all except Judah/Israel, which is to be restored, extended, and blessed. This section appears to be a unity, although verses 19-21 may be a later addition.

The date(s) of Obadiah cannot be fixed with absolute certainty. The proper starting point is with the primary historical allusion of the book. Verses 10-14 indicate that some calamity of distressing proportions had befallen Judah and especially Jerusalem. On this occasion the Edomites had behaved in a way not becoming a "brother," and even in more despicable ways. The point of importance here is that Jerusalem had been attacked and invaded. An invasion and some measure of devastation of Jerusalem is referred to and is in the not too distant past. A study of the Old Testament records will reveal five possible such occasions. The first recorded disaster to befall Jerusalem after it came into the hands of the Israelites[1] was in the time of Rehoboam of Judah when Shishak of Egypt invaded the city and carried off spoils.[2] The second occasion is more nebulous. The Chronicler alone records the invasion of Judah by the Philistines and Arabs ("who are near the Ethiopians"). No specific mention is made of Jerusalem, but the invasion of the city is undoubtedly implied by the mention of spoils and of inhabitants having been taken from the king's house.[1] A third possible occasion was the invasion by Jehoash of Israel when Amaziah was king of Judah.[2] This invasion is recorded immediately following and in connection with a successful expedition into Edom on the part of Amaziah. In this foray into Jerusalem Jehoash of Israel broke down a part of the city wall, carried off valuables and hostages, and returned to Samaria. No attempt to occupy the city is indicated. The fourth disaster that, according to the historians of Israel, befell Jerusalem was at the hands of Nebuchadrezzar, King of Babylon, in the reign of Jehoiachin (597 B.C.).[3] The fifth disaster to befall Jerusalem was the 587 B.C. capture and destruction of the city with the accompanying exile of the Judaeans.[4]

---

[1] II Samuel 5:6-10.

[2] I Kings 14:25, 26; II Chronicles 12:1-12. John Gray, Archaeology and the Old Testament World (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1962), p. 146. Perhaps there was only payment of tribute to prevent invasion and plunder. Noth, History of Israel, p. 238. Albright disagrees with Noth at this point, however. W. F. Albright, "New Light From Egypt on the Chronology and History of Israel and Judah," BASOR, CXXX (1953), 7. See also George Ernest Wright, "The Archaeology of Palestine," The Bible and the Ancient Near East, edited by by Wright (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1961), pp. 73-112, and B. Mazar, "The Campaign of Pharaoh Shishak to Palestine," Supplement to Vetus Testamentum, IV (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957), pp. 57-66.

Of these possible occasions the invasion of Shishak must be considered very unlikely. The Edomites were subject to the Israelites in that era. They were also under attack in the campaign of Shishak.[5] The invasion of Jehoash of Israel in the time of Amaziah is also highly unlikely. Amaziah, it is reported by the historian, had just returned from a very successful campaign against the Edomites. The invasion of the Philistines and the Arabians must remain a possibility; however, there is some validity to doubts concerning this invasion. The Chronicler alone records it. While it is unwise to say that the Chronicler is always unreliable in historical events recorded nowhere else, it is fair to observe that the historians of Samuel-Kings are usually more reliable. It would be more than an oddity if a major calamity had befallen Jerusalem and escaped mention in the works of the Samuel-Kings historians. Yet the historicity of this recorded event cannot be completely ruled out. If the accuracy of the Chronicler's account is accepted, there are several arguments that may be cited in support of the view that Obadiah did have this event in mind in his writing. No reference is made to the destruction of the Temple. The language of Obadiah is characterized by purity of Hebrew and the absence of Aramaisms. The possibility that Jeremiah 49 is authentic and that Jeremiah is quoting from Obadiah must be noted. There are some indications that the prophet is still within the narrow bounds of pre-Exilic Palestine: it can be argued that the nations mentioned are not the Exilic neighbors of Israel but her earlier foes; the references in Amos, if 1:6, 9, 11 are genuine, depict similar sins of the Edomites; there is no reference to an Edomite encroachment in the south country as there would have been after the Exile; there is no reference or allusion to Nebuchadrezzar. These and more nebulous arguments are cited as indications of an early date for Obadiah, reflecting the time of Jehoram (ca. 845 B.C.).[1] Although the arguments marshaled to support this early date for Obadiah are numerous, the sum of the arguments is neither strong nor convincing. Too much rests upon the absence of something or a questioned dating of a passage from another prophetic oracle. When the weaknesses of the supporting arguments for accepting the 845 B.C. occasion as that which brought forth this indignant oration from Obadiah are added to the recognition of the dubious character of the Chronicles passage relating to the 845 B.C. invasion of Judah, the acceptance of this identification is rendered most difficult and must be rejected as the occasion for the composition of the book of Obadiah.

---

[1] II Chronicles 21:16, 17.

[2] II Kings 14:8-14; II Chronicles 25:17-24.

[3] II Kings 24:10-17. It seems probable that the event of captivity ascribed by the Chronicler (II Chronicles 36:6, 7) to Jehoiakim may indeed belong to Jehoiachin.

[4] II Kings 25:3-21; II Chronicles 36:17-21.

[5] B. Mazar, "The Campaign of Pharaoh Shishak to Palestine," Supplement to VT, IV, pp. 65, 66; Albright, "New Light from Egypt," BASOR, CXXX (1953), 7, fn. 14.

---

[1] Weiser, The Old Testament, p. 248; Lanchester, CB Obadiah, pp. 12-14; Ernst Sellin, Introduction to the Old Testament, translated by W. Montgomery (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1923), p. 172.

The 597 B.C. and 587 B.C. invasions of Judah remain as possible occasions for the writing of Obadiah. In 597 B.C. Jehoiakim was rebelling after three years of loyalty to Nebuchadrezzar. The historian records in Kings that Nebuchadrezzar sent[1] bands of Chaldaeans against Judah along with bands of Edomites,[2] Moabites, and Ammonites. Nebuchadrezzar, who had probably been busy elsewhere in his sprawling kingdom, appeared on the scene shortly and besieged Jerusalem, accepted the surrender of the city, and deported the leading elements of the Jewish citizenry.[3] In the book of the prophet Jeremiah there appears evidence that may seem contradictory to any view that the events preceding 597 B.C. gave rise to the intense hatred of Edom that spawned Obadiah and other "Damn-Edom" oracles. Jeremiah[4] records that immediately following the events of 597 B.C., in the beginning of the reign of Zedekiah, there were envoys from Edom, Moab, and Ammon in Jerusalem plotting against the Neo-Babylonian Empire. It seems less than likely that envoys from Edom would have been welcomed in Jerusalem if such unbrotherly conduct as is related in

---

[1] Deleting יהוה from the MT with Vaticanus and others.

[2] Reading אדם for ארם, supported by the Syriac. See supra, Chapter I, p. 3, fn. 3.

[3] II Kings 24:1-17.

[4] Jeremiah 27:1-3.

Obadiah had occurred so recently. Yet it may be fair to note that difficult times and common problems and enemies often make allies of the bitterest of enemies. The possible parts played by internal politics in the two nations and by international intrigue must be recognized also. That there is no sound basis for a pre-Exilic occasion or date for the writing of the entire prophecy of Obadiah is granted, but the possibility remains that portions of the book may date from this time. The results of the foregoing studies point, by the process of elimination, to the events of 587 B.C. as the most likely occasion for this prophecy.

The view cannot be supported that Edom was an ally of Judah in 587 B.C., nor can the contention be demonstrated beyond any doubt that Edom was actively engaged in support of Nebuchadrezzar's campaign against Judah; yet the latter is clearly indicated by the available evidence. The consensus of the scholarly world concerning the occasion of the book of Obadiah is that it was the 587 B.C. destruction of Jerusalem over which the Edomites rejoiced in such an unbrotherly manner. The possibility of a post-Exilic occasion for this prophecy remains to be discussed in Chapter III of this study.

In consideration of the date of Obadiah some account must be made of the similarities of various portions of his prophecy with other portions of the Old Testament. Parallels have been pointed out with Joel, Jeremiah, Amos, and Numbers (the Song of Balaam).[1] Of these the striking and significant parallels are with Joel and Jeremiah, and in both cases the question of dependence must be raised. It seems most likely that Jeremiah and Obadiah were both dependent on an earlier original of the "Damn-Edom" oracle[2] used in their works but that Joel was dependent on Obadiah.[1]

---

[1] Lanchester, CB Obadiah, pp. 15, 16.

[2] Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 585, and many others.

Content. The oracle of Obadiah contains a prediction of the punishment that is to befall or that is befalling Edom, a description of the hostility of Edom toward Judah in the day of her distress, and a prediction of the coming of the Day of Yahweh upon all nations, especially on Edom, coupled with the restoration and exaltation of the house of Judah. The concept of Jewish nationalism is seen in the various parts of the oracle, in the cry for revenge upon the hated Edomites as well as in the restoration and glorification of the Jewish nation.

Translation.

1. The vision of Obadiah.

Thus said the Lord Yahweh regarding Edom,
(A report we have heard from Yahweh,
A messenger has been sent among the nations:
Rise up, let us rise up against her for battle).

2. Behold, small I will make you among the nations,
You are despised greatly.

3. The insolence of your heart has beguiled you,
Who dwell in the clefts of the rock;
High is his dwelling, as he is saying in his heart:
"Who will bring me down to earth?"

4. If you are raised up as an eagle,
And if among the stars your nest is put,
From thence I will throw you down,
Oracle of Yahweh.

5. If thieves came to you,
If plunderers by night
(How you are destroyed!)
Would they not steal enough for themselves?
If grape-gatherers came to you,
Would they not leave the gleanings?

---

[1] Weiser, The Old Testament, p. 249, and many others.

6. How Esau will be searched out,[1]
His treasures sought for!

7. Unto the border they will send you away,
All the men of your covenant will lead you astray,
Your confederates will overcome you,
Your friends will put a trap under you;
There is no understanding it.

8. Will it not be in that day (Oracle of Yahweh)
That I will destroy the wise men from Edom
And understanding from Mount Esau?

9. And your mighty men shall be dismayed, O Teman,
So that each man shall be cut off from Mount Esau by slaughter.

10. For the violence done your brother Jacob shame shall
cover you and you shall be cut off to hidden ages.

11. On the day when you stood by,
On the day when foreigners took captive his wealth,
And strange men entered his gate
And upon Jerusalem cast lots,
Even you were as one of them.

12. But you should not have looked (with satisfaction) on
the day of your brother in the day of his misfortune,
And you should not have rejoiced over the sons of Judah
in the day of their ruin,
And you should not have made your mouth strong in the
day of distress.

13. You should not have entered the gate of my people in the
day of their distress,
You should not have looked (with satisfaction)--even
you--in his bad situation, in the day of his distress,
And you should not have taken away his wealth in the
day of his calamity.

14. You should not have stood at the fork of the road to
intercept his escapees,
And you should not have delivered up his survivors in
the day of distress.

15. For the Day of Yahweh is drawing near upon all the
nations:
As you have done, it shall be done unto you,
Your reward shall return upon your own head.

---

[1] In parallelism עשו could be emended to עשׂה , noun from עשׂה to cover, envelop. Joseph Reider, "Etymological Studies in Biblical Hebrew," *VT*, IV (1954), 292.

16. For as you have drunk upon my holy mountain
All the nations shall drink continually;
They shall drink, they shall swallow,
And they shall be as they were not.

17. But in Mount Zion there shall be deliverance,
And it shall be holy,
And the House of Jacob shall possess their possession.

18. The house of Jacob shall be a fire,
The house of Joseph a flame,
The house of Esau stubble--
And they shall burn them and devour them,
And there shall not be a survivor of the house of Esau,
For Yahweh has spoken.

19. Those of the Negeb shall possess Mount Esau;
Those of the Shephelah, Philistia:
They shall possess the land of Ephraim and the land of
Samaria;
And Benjamin (shall possess) Gilead.

20. And the exiles of Halah who are of the sons of Israel
shall possess Canaan unto Zarephath,
And the exiles of Jerusalem who are in Sepharad[1] shall
possess the cities of the Negeb.

21. And deliverers shall go up from Mount Zion to rule
Mount Esau,
And the kingdom shall be Yahweh's.

Commentary and interpretation. The message of Obadiah is identified as a prophetic message--"the vision of Obadiah."[2] The first portion of this brief book, 1b-9 was probably borrowed by Obadiah from an older "Damn-Edom" oracle[3] that is of uncertain date, but probably comes from the period of the fall of Jerusalem, ca. 587 B.C. The possibility must be admitted that a date for the older oracle of ca. 597 B.C. is within the realm of possibility. It is unlikely that the underlying oracle can be dated earlier.[1] It is probable that a long period of time did not elapse between the composition of the oracle and Obadiah's use of it in his prophetic message.

---

[1] John Gray, "The Diaspora of Israel and Judah in Obadiah, v. 20," ZAW, LXV (1953), 53-59, identifies Sepharad with Hesperides in the vicinity of Benghazi, ancient Berenice, in North Africa.

[2] Weiser, ATD Obadja, p. 208. This is a more or less technical designation of prophecy, identifying it as a message from Yahweh. It is held in common with other Old Testament prophetic books. This designation probably had its origin in ecstatic experiences. Here the term is probably attached editorially to the collected oracles and carries no necessary indication of ecstasy.

[3] Driver, Introduction, pp. 318-321; Thompson, IB Obadiah, pp. 858, 859; Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 585.

The Edomites were allies with the Neo-Babylonian Empire against Judah. The brother-nations had long been jealous of one another, and hatred had long smouldered. The viewpoint of Judah seems to have been that it was quite acceptable for the conflict with Edom to go on--as long as it was their own private war; besides, the Edomites had never really held the upper hand. But now, when Judah was under attack by one who should have been considered the enemy of Edom as well, it was unthinkable that Edom should join this common enemy to inflict punishment on Judah. So a "Hymn of Hate" came from a prophet expressing what he sincerely understood to be the purpose of Yahweh to defend and avenge his chosen people. This older oracle was probably adapted somewhat by Obadiah to serve his purposes, but the degree of adaptation and the specific elements thereof are conjectural.

The perfects of the verbs in the passage are to be interpreted as prophetic perfects[2] by which the prophet speaks of the fate in store for the confident and high-thinking Edomites. Some interpreters are concerned too much with mechanics and literalism in arguing about the plural form in verse 1 which is replaced by the singular in the parallel from Jeremiah 49: "We/I have heard"; i.e., the message is known! Again, "a messenger has been sent among the nations" may be intended as an announcement that the messenger has been or will be sent. However, it seems much more likely that this is a literary device of the prophet to introduce and set the stage for his prophetic message.[1] The message is that Edom shall be damned--made small and utterly despised, even left without a survivor. This coming littleness and destruction is in direct contrast with the pride, haughtiness, and secure greatness found in Edom. The mention of living in the clefts of the rocks may refer to Selaʿ, later Petra,[2] the virtually inaccessible fortress, or collectively to the rocky fortresses of Seir.[3] But no matter how high, mighty, and secure Edom may feel, she is due for a great fall, for the promise of giving Edom her just deserts is the word of Yahweh.

---

[1] In assigning a date for this passage, the parallels of verses 1-5 with Jeremiah 49 are of little significance since Jeremiah 49 is probably not from the hand of Jeremiah. Both Obadiah and Jeremiah (or a later editor of Jeremiah) employed an independent oracle--edited, added to, and used according to their own style and purpose. Weiser, The Old Testament, p. 248.

[2] Weiser, ATD Obadja, p. 209. GKC, pp. 312, 313 (Section 106n): "The prophet so transports himself in imagination into the future that he describes the future event as if it had been already seen or heard by him. . . ." Cf. also comments on "the religious importance of the present" in R.B.Y. Scott, The Relevance of the Prophets (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953), pp. 149-153; and Frank R. Blake, A Resurvey of Hebrew Tenses (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1951), p. 17; and G. R. Driver, Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1936), pp. 135, 136.

Verses 5-9 continue the theme of destruction that is to come upon Edom. The view that verse 5 makes a fresh start and points to another hand in composition[4] is rejected here. The progression in thought is quite logical. There is no reason to insist upon a sudden shift from prophetic perfects to simple perfects in verses 5, 6, and 7 and back to prophetic perfects in verse 8; and there are continuing parallels with Jeremiah 49, not as exact after verse 5, but existing in verses 6, 8, and 9a.[1] Verses 5 and 6 stand as a unity in thought. Thieves and robbers by night steal only enough for themselves, grape-gatherers leave gleanings, but Edom will not thus be spared. Nothing will be left; even hidden treasures will be found. The intensity and extent of the destruction is seen in the attitude of friends: Edom has no friends left. Those who would be expected to qualify as her friends will drive the Edomites not only out of a portion of her territory but even to the border; i.e., all of Seir shall be taken. Her allies ("men of your covenant") will lead her astray, her confederates ("men of your peace") will overcome her, and her friends[2] will put a trap under her. It is almost an aside as the prophet adds "there is no understanding it." The Edomites will be bewildered at such a turning of friends and such unthinkable calamities. "That day" in verse 8 is not the Day of Yahweh, but the day of the judgment of Edom. On that day the extent of Yahweh's destruction will encompass even the wise men, for whose wisdom Edom was traditionally famous.[1] As a final note before turning to another train of thought, the prophet is not willing to leave the possible hope that the heroes of the land may be able to stand--for they will be dismayed. The result will be the slaughter of each man.

---

[1] In general, similar to Isaiah 1: the controversy of God with Israel to which heaven and earth are called as witnesses; or to Isaiah 5--did he really sing?; and more pointedly, to Isaiah 34, in which the nations are called upon to draw near and listen to the enraged hatred of Yahweh for the nations, especially Edom. See especially pp. 128-133 of B. Gemser, "The RÎB-or Controversy-Pattern in Hebrew Mentality," Supplement to VT, III, 1955, Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955), pp. 120-137.

[2] The identification of Selaʿ with Petra has been doubted; the identification remains as probable.

[3] Bewer, ICC Obadiah, p. 21.

[4] Indicated by arrangement of the text in the RSV; also, Bewer, ICC Obadiah, p. 22.

---

[1] See infra, pp. 76, 77.

[2] Here a textual problem exists, for the Hebrew MT says only "your bread." Various solutions have been suggested: to omit "your bread" with the LXX, to emend לַחְמְךָ to לְחֲמֶיךָ (to war against you), to supply אֹכְלֵי (eaters of your bread) or אַנְשֵׁי (men of your bread), to translate "your flesh" based on a similar Arabic stem, to understand it with the following clause: "your bread they will make a trap under you," or to emend to לְחֶמְּךָ (to scare you). Bewer, ICC Obadiah, pp. 24, 39. The better choices are either to omit with the LXX or to supply "eaters of," thus "close friends" by custom bound to protect and defend the ones with whom they eat.

The reference may be to the beginning of the encroachment of the Nabataeans, if such could be unquestionably demonstrated in the Exilic period. See supra, Chapter I, pp. 43-45.

The section 10-14 probably represents the major contribution of "Obadiah" to the oracle as it now stands. In addition to appropriating, editing, and adding to the older oracle that forms the nucleus of verses 1-9, he composed and added these verses. In essence the prophet brings the "Damn-Edom" oracle up to date, interpreting the Hebrew hatred of Edom against the background of his day. He probably stands in the period of the Exile, less than a generation from 587 B.C., unless one could satisfactorily demonstrate a later catastrophe to Jerusalem, such as Morgenstern attempts for 485 B.C.[2]

Verses 10-14 give with fresh and penetrating hatred the causes for the destruction that is to fall on Edom. First is the charge given in general terms:

> For the violence done to your brother Jacob shame shall
> cover you, and you shall be cut off to hidden ages.

The occasion of this violence is then described. When strangers carried off Jacob's wealth and foreigners entered his gates and cast lots for Jerusalem--when all this happened, the Edomites stood by, even more, they behaved like the invaders. In verses 12-14, eight parallel statements delineate specific charges for which Edom deserves and shall receive punishment. These eight statements contain three basic charges: (1) unrestrained and openly expressed joy at the misfortune suffered by Judah, (2) looting the city of Jerusalem as it lay defenseless, and (3) intercepting the refugees from the destroyed city, either shutting them up, enslaving them, or delivering them up to the Babylonian conquerors or to slave traders. Such actions called forth this attitude and expression of "Damn-Edom Theology."[1]

---

[1] The accuracy of this tradition is outside the scope of this study. That there was a wisdom tradition in Edom is often referred to in the Old Testament. See *supra*, Chapter I, pp. 30, 31.

[2] See Chapter III, *infra*.

The last section of Obadiah, verses 15-21,[2] breathes the spirit of a later age. The theme is the Day of Yahweh--the coming of Yahweh's wrath in judgment upon all nations.[3] Only verses 18, 19a, and 21 from this passage are primarily concerned with Edom. The Hebrews are fire; the Edomites, stubble. When the two shall meet, Esau will be no more. Verses 19-21 may be a later addition to the oracle, but such a conclusion is not required. Verse 19a relates that in the expansion of the Jewish nation Mount Esau (Seir) shall be Jewish territory, and verse 21 speaks of deliverers going from Mount Zion to rule Mount Esau. The control of Seir shall be no more with the accursed Edomites. This passage, 15-21, contains nothing indicating an exact date. The tenor of the poetic message points rather clearly to post-Exilic times. With some arbitrariness confessed, an approximate date of 400 B.C. is assigned to verses 15-21.

---

[1] Many scholars place the date of this passage (1-14 or 5-14) later into the post-Exilic period. It is readily agreed that the final edition of this prophecy must stand as post-Exilic; but the vigor of this passage, the white heat of hatred, the freshness of the wounds revealed demand a date for the primary composition of this passage near the calamitous event that provoked it. For lack of another or better occasion the date must be placed within a generation of 587 B.C.

[2] There is no compelling reason to attach verse 15b to the previous section, as is often done. The sequence of thought is that this is an expression of the theological supposition behind the Day of Yahweh. The transition into the following sentence is smooth.

[3] See Ladislav Černý, *The Day of Yahweh and Some Relevant Problems* (Práce Z Vědeckých Ústavů, No. LIII, Praze: Nákladem Filosofické Fakulty University Karlovy, 1948).

It must be pointed out that while Obadiah gives the most forthright expression of "Damn-Edom Theology," this, while undoubtedly expressive of bitter hatred, is far more than a fanatical national hatred. The damnation of Edom is based upon the writer's idea of divine retributive justice: supposed blood-kin and neighbors who behave in such a way are certainly deserving of terrific punishment. The narrow particularism of the viewpoint set forth must be recognized, too. Judah/Israel is Yahweh's chosen people, and the covenant necessitates their restoration as surely as divine justice decrees the punishment of Edom. The faith "Obadiah" holds expresses itself in a conception of the eschatological reign of Yahweh as king (verse 21). With Weiser,

> We may perhaps think of Obadiah as a prophet of salvation in the circles faithful to Yahweh . . . . His oracles give us a supplementary insight into the sufferings and hopes after the collapse of Judah and reveal the association of religion with national aspirations which was one of the characteristics of the prophecies of salvation in Israel.[1]

Jeremiah 49:7-22

The oracle attributed traditionally to Jeremiah in his prophecy, 49:7-22, is closely related to Obadiah. That there was some literary relationship has been made evident in the preceding discussion. The Jeremianic "Damn-Edom" oracle stands as one in a series of ten oracles against the foreign nations,[2] comprising chapters 46-51. There are some valid indications that these oracles on foreign nations are not genuine prophecies of Jeremiah but are later additions to his work. First to be noted is the general observation concerning the composition of the book as a whole, succinctly stated by Hyatt:

---

[1] Weiser, The Old Testament, p. 249.

[2] These nations are, in the order of the Hebrew text: Egypt, Philistia, Moab, Ammon, Edom, Damascus, Kedar, Elam, and Babylonia.

> The reader who approaches the book of Jeremiah for the first time is likely to feel that there is much confusion in its arrangement. Ch. 1 does, to be sure, tell of the call of the prophet, and chs. 2-6 seem to be largely appropriate to the opening years of his career. But as one reads on, one finds various types of arrangement and sometimes no discernible pattern at all. Sometimes the material is in excellent chronological order, as in chs. 37-44. Elsewhere it is in topical order, as in chs. 21-23; 30-31; 46-51, so that if the reader wishes to follow the prophet's life step by step, or make a specific study of areas of thought, he must skip about from chapter to chapter and passage to passage.
>
> This seeming lack of order arises from the fact that this book, like many others in the Old Testament, is not the product of one person, or of a small group of persons. It is the product of growth over a long period of time, to which many contributed.[1]

Hyatt continues to say that in spite of long study no scholarly consensus has been reached as to either the stages in the composition or the process of growth resulting in the present day book of Jeremiah.[2]

The great difference between the MT and the LXX texts of Jeremiah, especially of the foreign nation oracles, causes one to raise questions concerning the authenticity of these oracles.[3] Considering the book of Jeremiah as a whole the LXX is shorter than the Hebrew by approximately one-eighth.[4]

---

[1] James Philip Hyatt, "The Book of Jeremiah, Introduction and Exegesis," (The Interpreter's Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick, in 12 volumes, New York: The Abingdon Press, 1959), IV, 787.

[2] Ibid., p. 787; Hyatt gives a suggested chronological arrangement of the prophecies of Jeremiah, James Philip Hyatt, Jeremiah, Prophet of Courage and Hope (New York: The Abingdon Press, 1958), pp. 117-119.

[3] Both the long (MT) and short (LXX) texts of Jeremiah have been found in incomplete form in the Hebrew manuscripts discovered at Qumran. Frank Moore Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies (The Haskell Lectures, 1956-1957, Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1958), p. 139.

[4] Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 487; Weiser, The Old Testament, p. 218. The LXX has some material not found in the MT, Henshaw, The Latter Prophets, p. 191.

The arrangement of the text of Jeremiah differs also in the MT and the LXX. The most significant difference is that the oracles on foreign nations follow 25:13a in the LXX while they stand as chapters 46-51 in the MT. The internal arrangement of the oracles within the group differs also from the MT to the LXX.[1] It can be seen that at the time when the LXX text of Jeremiah was made (3rd-2nd centuries B.C.) the text of Jeremiah was not fixed. It is impossible to state authoritatively which was the more original text.[2] The placing of the oracles after 25:13 seems quite logical, but the MT order of the oracles, a geographical grouping: Egypt and Philistia; Moab, Ammon, and Edom; Damascus and Kedar; Elam and Babylon, seems superior to the Greek arrangement. The textual additions and omissions in the two versions give indication, but not incontrovertible evidence, that the LXX text is superior to the Massoretic text.[3] Pfeiffer comments:

> Although it is conceivable that occasionally the LXX translators deliberately condensed the Hebrew when it seemed unduly diffuse and at other times accidently omitted a section of the prototype, in most cases the "omissions" of the LXX were not an original part of the book, but contributions of editors and readers.[4]

There is general agreement that the oracle on Edom is part of a relatively late addition to the text of Jeremiah.[5] It is possible that in 46-51 there are elements of genuine Jeremianic material. Lawerence Cord Hay, in a dissertation concerned with these oracles, attributes the oracle on Egypt and small fragments of other oracles to Jeremiah but lists not a word or phrase in the Edom oracle as definitely Jeremianic.[1] Hyatt attributes 46:2-12 alone of 46-51 to Jeremiah without question.[2] Mowinckel insists that the "Gentilic oracles" represent an independent complex of tradition with the possible presence of some Jeremianic elements, which was later joined to the larger book.[3] The original nucleus of these oracles is defended by Bardtke as Jeremianic. His contention is that there existed originally an independent booklet of oracles against foreign nations. Volz argues for the original unity of these oracles but traces them not to Jeremiah but to one of his followers.[4] Of the Edom oracle, 47:7-22, Rudolph would admit only verses 7, 8, and 22 as having come from Jeremiah.[5] Aeschimann attributes verses 7, 8, 10, 11, and 22 to Jeremiah.[6] While Lods argues for the authenticity of the foreign nations oracles generally, he regards the Edom oracle as suspect.[7] Leslie says: "Jer. 49:7-11 contains an authentic prophecy of Jeremiah which is probably based, as is Obad. 5-6, upon an older oracle. . . ." He contends that verse 22

---

[1] The MT order: Egypt, Philistia, Moab, Ammon, Edom, Damascus, Kedar, Elam, and Babylon; the LXX order: Elam, Egypt, Babylon, Philistia, Edom, Ammon, Kedar, Damascus, and Moab.

[2] The LXX order is defended by Volz, Pfeiffer, Rudolph, Weiser, and Eissfeldt; the MT order by Mowinckel and Lindblom. See Lindblom, *Prophecy in Ancient Israel*, p. 237, fn. 21.

[3] Henshaw, *The Latter Prophets*, p. 191; Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, pp. 486, 487.

[4] Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, p. 487.

[5] See Hyatt's analysis of the development of the text and of later additions thereto: Hyatt, *IB Jeremiah*, pp. 787-790; also Herbert G. May, "The Chronology of Jeremiah's Oracles," *JNES*, IV (1945), 217-227.

---

1. Lawerence Cord Hay, "The Oracles Against the Foreign Nations in Jeremiah 46-51," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1959), pp. 89 ff.

2. Hyatt, IB Jeremiah, p. 790.

3. Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament, II, 121.

4. Weiser, The Old Testament, pp. 215, 216.

5. Wilhelm Rudolph, Jeremia ("Handbuch zum Alten Testament," edited by Eissfeldt, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1958), pp. 266-269.

6. A. Aeschimann, Le Prophète Jérémie (Neuchâtel: Delachaux and Niestlé, 1959), p. 233.

7. Lods, Histoire, pp. 419, 420.

is also authentic.[1]

The oracles on foreign nations, it is concluded here, came into their present form after the time of Jeremiah but perhaps contain some authentic Jeremianic material.[2] This section was appended to the book of Jeremiah in the post-Exilic period.[3] The oracle on Edom is, then, post-Jeremianic and contains very little if anything from the pen of Jeremiah.[4]

Jeremiah's oracle against Edom is partially prose (49:13, 17-22) and partially poetry (47:7-11, 14-16). A significant majority of these poetic verses are strikingly paralleled in the poetry of Obadiah:

Jer. 49:14a	שמועה שמעתי מאת יהוה וציר בגוים שלוח
Obad. 1b	שמועה שמענו מאת יהוה וציר בגוים שלח
Jer. 49:14b	התקבצו ובאו עליה וקומו למלחמה
Obad. 1c	קומו ונקומה עליה למלחמה
Jer. 49:15	כי הנה קטן נתתיך בגוים בזוי באדם
Obad. 2	הנה קטן נתתיך בגוים בזוי אתה מאד
Jer. 49:16a	תפלצתך השיא אתך זדון לבך
Obad. 3b	זדון לבך השיאך
Jer. 49:16b	שכני בחגוי הסלע תפשי מרום גבעה
Obad. 3b	שכני בחגוי סלע מרום שבתו
Obad. 3c	אמר בלבו מי יורדני ארץ

---

[1] Elmer A. Leslie, *Jeremiah Chronologically Arranged, Translated, and Interpreted* (New York: The Abingdon Press, 1954), pp. 172, 173.

[2] The original Jeremianic material probably comes from ca. 605-601 B.C. Hyatt, *Jeremiah, Prophet of Courage and Hope*, pp. 41, 42; Weiser, *The Old Testament*, p. 216.

[3] Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, pp. 506-508; Weiser, *The Old Testament*, p. 216.

[4] Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, p. 507; Hay, "Jeremiah 46-51," pp. 89 ff.; Hyatt, *IB Jeremiah*, pp. 1118, 1119. John Skinner, *Prophecy and Religion* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1940), p. 240, says "the effort to disentangle a Jeremianic nucleus in the various oracles hardly repays the labour spent upon it."

Jer. 49:16c	כי תבגיה כנשר קנך משם אור ידך
Obad. 4a	אם תבגיה כנשר ככבים שים קנך משם אור ידך
Jer. 16d	נאם יהוה
Obad. 4b	נאם יהוה
Jer. 49:9a	אם בצרים באו לך לו ישארו עוללות
Obad. 5b	אם בצרים באו לך הלוא ישאירו עללות
Jer. 49:9b	אם גנבים בלילה השחיתו
Obad. 5a	אם גנבים באו לך אם שודדי לילה איך נדיתה
Jer. 49:9b (cont.)	דים
Obad. 5a (cont.)	הלוא יגנבו דים

There are also less exact parallels with other phrases of Jeremiah's poetry, especially 49:7 with Obadiah 8. The most significant difference between Jeremiah 49:7-22 and Obadiah is that the concepts of the Day of Yahweh and the restoration of Israel are not explicitly set forth in the Jeremianic passage. To express the relationship between these two passages more exactly, then, Jeremiah 49:7-22 parallels Obadiah 1-14. The parallel between the latter part of Obadiah and Jeremiah 49 is vague, if such exists at all.

An outline of Jeremiah 49:7-22 reveals the content of this expression of Damn-Edom Theology:

1. The traditional wisdom is gone from Edom. (7)
2. Calamity will befall Edom. (8)
3. The degree of destruction will be total annihilation. (9, 10)

[4. A later addition to the oracle. (11)]

5. The certainty of the coming destruction. (12, 13)
6. Edom's present pride is contrasted with her coming fall. (14-16)
7. The coming destruction is with Yahweh's purpose and plan. (19-21)
8. The coming terror will render Edom's warriors ineffective. (22)

Concerning this passage in Jeremiah note has been made that verse 9 parallels Obadiah 5 and verses 14-16 parallel Obadiah 1-4. There are thought parallels with no significant new element in Jeremiah between verse 7 and Obadiah 8, verse 10a and Obadiah 6, and verse 22b and Obadiah 9a. Verse 8 contains no specific new element of thought. It speaks in general terms of coming calamity.[1] Verse 10 relates how complete will be the exposure and destruction of Edom and adds to previously noted thoughts that the brothers and neighbors of Edom will share its fate. Verse 11 is an intrusion of "sweetness and light" in the midst of a picture of doom, suggesting that the widows and fatherless children of the Edomites will be cared for by Yahweh. In contrast, total destruction is elsewhere the theme of "Damn-Edom Theology." In this same passage, verse 10 says: "His [Edom's] children are destroyed"; and verse 20: "Even the little ones of the flock shall be dragged away; surely their fold shall be appalled at their fate." Verse 11 is rejected as a later intrusion which is foreign to "Damn-Edom Theology."[2] Verses 12 and 13 are in prose and speak of how certainly the cup of wrath will be drunk by Edom, especially since those who did not deserve to drink had to drink of the cup. These verses seem to reflect Jeremiah 25:15-29, where the cup of the wine of Yahweh's wrath is given to all the nations (verse 26), including Edom (verse 21).[1] Verses 14-16 parallel Obadiah 1-4 almost exactly, adding nothing to the "Damn-Edom" thought. Verses 17 and 18 reiterate the completeness of Edom's coming destruction, likening it to Sodom and Gomorrah. Verses 19-21 have no parallels in Obadiah or elsewhere in "Damn-Edom" passages. These verses are almost identical with and are probably adapted from Jeremiah 50:44-46, where they speak of Babylon.[2] The passage, although earlier applied to Babylon, speaks of God's purpose and plan in the coming destruction of Edom as well as of the horror attending and the completeness of her downfall. The content of verse 20b stands as a direct contradiction of verse 11, giving some evidence that after verse 11 came into the oracle verses 19-21 were taken over as they stood in the Babylon oracle with changes only in place names. Verse 22 tells of the complete amazement and total loss of courage which shall befall Edom in the day of her destruction. This verse is similar in thought to Obadiah 9 and parallel in form and expression with Jeremiah 48:40,[3] the oracle

---

[1] Dedan is the name of a tribe descended from Abraham and Keturah (Genesis 10:7). Their home was probably southeast of Edom. According to Ezekiel 27:15, 20; 38:13 the Dedanites carried on caravan trade between Tyre and Arabia. A. W. Streane, The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Together with Lamentations ("The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges," edited by A. F. Kirkpatrick, Cambridge: The University Press, 1913), p. 115.

W. F. Albright has presented evidence supporting the identification of Dedan with the oasis, el-ʻUla in the northern Hedjaz. "Whether the name Dedan was first applied to the oasis of el-ʻUla and thence extended to cover an ethnic group which originated in that vicinity, or was first applied to a nomadic people and subsequently to a place named after them, must remain uncertain; there are excellent parallels for both developments. Nor can we say whether the name was originally Semitic or non-Semitic, though I incline to the former alternative. In any case, its use as a designation of Semitic nomads goes back over a thousand years before the earliest biblical allusion, while it does not appear as a place-name in proto-Arabic inscriptions before the sixth century B.C." (p. 12).

Albright contends that there is no evidence for an Edomite Dedan. By this he means that there was no Dedan within the borders of Edom's sedentary domain. Edom was both settled and semi-nomadic, and she controlled the desert to the south in periods of expansion (p. 8). W. F. Albright, "Dedan," (Geschichte und Altes Testament, v. XVI of Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie, Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1953), pp. 1-12.

[2] Hyatt (IB Jeremiah, pp. 1118, 1119) suggests that verse 11 is part of

---

a small nucleus of Jeremiah 49:7-22 that could be from Jeremiah, but he holds as improbable that this or any other part of the oracle is from Jeremiah. Streane (CB Jeremiah, p. 285) says: "A remarkable v. and decidedly Jeremianic in character, as compared with the attitude which later days would have assumed towards an enemy so bitterly hated. On the other hand, it is extremely abrupt in the midst of denunciation." By other commentators this verse is largely ignored.

[1] Hyatt, IB Jeremiah, p. 1119. The possibility of relation with Obadiah 16 must be raised. There may be some connection in the concept of drinking as a figure of punishment, but there seem to be no literary relationships.

[2] Rudolph, HAT Jeremia, p. 269; Weiser, ATD Jeremia, p. 417; Hyatt, IB Jeremiah, p. 1120.

[3] Weiser, ATD Jeremia, p. 418.

on Moab, from which place it was possibly taken and adapted to the Edom oracle.

Ezekiel 25:12-14 and 35:1-15

The book of the prophet Ezekiel contains two passages in which Edom is condemned, 25:12-14 and 35:1-15. Like Isaiah and Jeremiah, Ezekiel also contains a section of oracles against foreign nations (chapters 25-32). These oracles separate chapters 1-24 which denounce the sins of Israel from chapters 33-48 which give promise and plans of restoration and of the future community of God's people. Whether the oracles are of genuine Ezekielian authorship or not, the arrangement of these oracles seems to suggest that the restoration and establishment of the ideal state would be dependent on the defeat of these neighboring nations and the removal of them from Israel's territory.[1] There is considerable difference of opinion concerning the authenticity of these oracles.[2] The seven oracles are accepted by some,[3] rejected by others.[1] Hölscher accepted as genuine the long oracles (on Tyre and Egypt) while rejecting the others.[2] The oracles are found by other scholars to contain genuine nuclei of Ezekielian material.[3]

---

[1] G. A. Cooke, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel ("International Critical Commentary," edited by S. R. Driver, C. A. Briggs, and Alfred Plummer, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1936), p. 281.

[2] There is, of course, widespread difference of opinion on the unity, authorship, authenticity, etc., of the book as a whole. A valuable examination of works on Ezekiel is: H. H. Rowley, "The Book of Ezekiel and Modern Study," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXXIV (1953), 146-190. A more recent listing of such commentaries is found in: Peter R. Ackroyd, "Commentaries on Ezekiel," Theology, LXII (1959), 97-100.

[3] Carl G. Howie, The Book of Ezekiel, The Book of Daniel ("Layman's Bible Commentary," edited by B. H. Kelly, Vol. XIII, Richmond: John Knox Press, 1961), pp. 94, 95; W. F. Lofthouse, The Prophet of Reconstruction (London: James Clarke and Company, Ltd., 1920), pp. 143-150; A. B. Davidson, The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, revised by A. W. Streane ("The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges," edited by A. F. Kirkpatrick, Cambridge: The University Press, 1924), pp. 195, 196; Henry A. Redpath, The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel ("Westminster Commentaries," edited by Walter Lock, London: Methuen and Company, 1907), pp. 128-132; Gautier, Introduction, I, 435, 436; Kuhl, Prophets of Israel, p. 111.

The oracle on Edom in Ezekiel 25:12-14 is a brief oracle, similar in form to the preceding oracles in chapter 25 on Ammon (1-7) and Moab (8-11)[4] and the following oracle on the Philistines (15-17). The denunciation of Edom is stated briefly and in very general terms. The accusation directed against her is that she "acted revengefully against the house of Judah" (verse 12). The punishment decreed is complete destruction and desolation[5] which, significantly, is to be effected by "Israel" as the instrument of Yahweh's wrath (verse 14).[6]

---

[1] Charles Cutler Torrey, Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy (Yale Oriental Series, Researches, Vol. XVIII, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930), p. 78.

[2] Gustav Hölscher, Hesekiel, der Dichter und das Buch (BZAW, Vol. XXXIX, Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1924), pp. 131-134. Cf. Cooke, ICC Ezekiel, p. 201.

[3] J. M. Powis Smith, The Prophets and Their Times, 2nd edition, revised by William A. Irwin (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941), p. 208; William A. Irwin, The Problem of Ezekiel (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943), pp. 181-183.

[4] "Seir," occurring in verse 8 is to be omitted from the text with the LXX and Old Latin. Cf. Herbert G. May, "The Book of Ezekiel, Introduction and Exegesis," (The Interpreter's Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick, in 12 volumes, New York: The Abingdon Press, 1956), VI, 202.

[5] Ezekiel 25:13. Read for מתמן וּדְדָנֶה , מתמן וּדְדָנָה . "The ו is correct; if the accent is shifted from תמן to דדנה and this is vocalised דְּדָנָה , the meaning will be 'from Teman to Dedan.'" G. R. Driver, "Ezekiel, Linguistic and Textual Problems," Biblica, XXXV (1954), 156.

[6] Verse 14 may be a later addition to this oracle. The execution of Yahweh's vengeance by Israel does not agree with Ezekiel's concept of the future. The hatred of later times, perhaps as late as the Maccabaean period may be reflected. (Cooke, ICC Ezekiel, p. 285.) The writer does not admit a Maccabaean date for such an addition but agrees that a late addition may be present here.

Chapter 35 of the book of Ezekiel denounces Edom more vehemently and with much more exactness. This oracle precedes a general denunciation of the "rest of the nations" in chapter 37 in which Edom alone is singled out by name.[1] One question that demands consideration in a study of this chapter is, why a second oracle on Edom and not on other nations? The answer lies in the singularly intense hatred of the Jews for the Edomites,[2] especially in the Exilic and post-Exilic periods--a hatred far exceeding their hatred of other nations. Another facet of the answer lies in the fact that "Edom" became a symbolic representation of the enemies of the restored community in general. From Ezekiel comes additional evidence that a "Damn-Edom Theology" was a real and lively part of the life and thought of Judaism in the 6th and following centuries B.C. There is no unanimity on the problems of date and authenticity of chapter 35. In respect to authenticity chapter 35 is more suspect than is 25:12-14. H. G. May says: "This is neither a great oracle nor the editor at his best. . . . A number of scholars see this as a non-Ezekielian production. . . ."[3] Some scholars find a short but genuine nucleus in the chapter,[4] while others accept the oracle as authentic.[5] With refreshing forthrightness Cooke admits much uncertainty and, after citing various possibilities, concludes that " . . . Ezekiel himself may have introduced the chapter to add emphasis to the threats in ch. 36."[1] The chapter is probably a later addition to the text of Ezekiel, but perhaps is built around a genuine nucleus of thought if not of words. Three possibilities are recognized as reason for the presence of the oracle as a reiterative and specific denunciation of Edom: the continuing bitterness and unbounded hatred of Edom for her actions against Judah, the new aggravation of old wounds by the Edomites since the oracle in chapter 25 was composed,[2] and the developing tendency to use "Edom" as a designation of the enemies of the Jews.

---

[1] Verse 5; the rest of the nations are evidently those around Judah.

[2] H. Wheeler Robinson, Two Hebrew Prophets (London: Lutterworth Press, 1948), p. 113.

[3] May, IB Ezekiel, p. 256; Volkmar Herntrich, Ezekiel-probleme (BZAW LXI, Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1933), p. 115; Hölscher, Hesekiel, p. 172; Torrey, Pseudo-Ezekiel, p. 78.

[4] Smith-Irwin, The Prophets and Their Times, pp. 184, 185; May, IB Ezekiel, p. 256.

[5] Davidson-Streane, CB Ezekiel, pp. 275 ff.; Carl Gordon Howie, The Date and Composition of Ezekiel (JBL Monograph Series, Vol. IV, Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1950), pp. 98, 99; H. L. Ellison, Ezekiel: the Man and His Message (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956), pp. 122-124; W. F. Lofthouse, The Prophet of Reconstruction, pp. 157, 158; Redpath, WC Ezekiel, pp. 190-192.

Chapter 35 contains, after two verses introducing the oracle, two primary elements so intermixed that an outline is almost impossible. Edom's devastation is predicted, and the reasons for her devastation are given. The devastation is to be a complete annihilation of Edom. There is no evidence of literary relationships, especially such as existed between Obadiah and Jeremiah 49, but the thought of Ezekiel 35 has much in common with both Jeremiah 49 and Obadiah as well as other "Damn-Edom" oracles. The prophet speaks of the devastation of the land,[3] the destruction of her cities,[4] and the slaughter of her inhabitants.[5] The reasons cited for this destruction are: hostility in the time of Judah's distress including deliverance of the "sons of Israel to the power of the sword,"[6] the attempt to take over the land of Judah which is the possession of Yahweh,[7] the proud boasting of Edom,[8] and the recurring reason, or perhaps the desired result, that the Edomites shall know Yahweh and his power.[1]

---

[1] Cooke, ICC Ezekiel, p. 382.

[2] Cf. ibid., p. 381.

[3] Verses 3, 4, 7, 14, 15.

[4] Verses 4, 9.

[5] Verses 6, 8.

[6] Verse 5.

[7] Verses 10, 12. Lods, The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism, p. 225, contends that Ezekiel predicted the destruction of Edom, without which it did not seem to him that Israel could be restored--Edom occupied part of Israel's territory.

[8] Verse 13.

The elements included in Ezekiel 25:12-14 and 35:1-15 which have not presented themselves in Obadiah and Jeremiah are significant additions to "Damn-Edom Theology." The attempt of Edom to take possession of Judah's territory, seemingly in the time of the Exile, is brought forward as a reason for the condemnation of Edom. This did come, probably not in the time of the Exile except for scattered Edomite settlements, but soon thereafter as a result of the Nabataean invasion of the old homeland of Edom.[2] The concept that the destruction which is to befall Edom is designed in part to bring the Edomites to a recognition of Yahweh as Lord has been discerned, but doubtfully, in Obadiah. It may occur there in verse 21: "Deliverers shall go up from Mount Zion to rule Mount Esau; and the kingdom shall be Yahweh's." This verse has been discussed earlier as a late addition to Obadiah, and it probably refers to territorial expansion and control. Thus the concept of a "missionary" purpose in Edom's doom is to be considered an addition to "Damn-Edom Theology" by the writer of Ezekiel 35.

Lamentations 4:21, 22

The book of Lamentations, the dirge over the fallen city, Jerusalem, contains the assurance that the same or at least a similar destruction as that which befell Jerusalem lay in store for the Edomites. The passage that contains this assurance, 4:21, 22, probably comes from the late Exilic (or possibly the early post-Exilic) period. The rejoicing of Edom over the misfortune of Jerusalem is indicated as the reason for her doom. The place name, Uz, is located in this passage and in Genesis 36:28 (I Chronicles 34:35) in Edom but elsewhere in the Old Testament is variously located.[1] It is quite noticeable that in verse 22 the concepts of the punishment of Edom and the restoration of Judah are tied together.[2] The relationship is not stated. Perhaps the former was considered necessary for the accomplishment of the latter.[3] It will be good to note here also that that which is almost universally translated "daughter of Edom" is not "Edom's little girl" but, in an appositive construction, "Daughter, Edom."[4] This passage from Lamentations makes no significant contribution of new ideas to "Damn-Edom Theology" but does contain vehement expression of the characteristic thought of previously noted oracles.

---

[1] Verses 4, 15.

[2] The date of this invasion is uncertain. See supra, Chapter I, pp. 43-45.

Joel 4:19 (English 3:19)

The book of the prophet Joel contains only a brief mention of Edom, and that along with Egypt, for having done violence to the people of Judah and for having shed innocent blood in their land.[1] The passage 2:30-3:21[2] tells of coming doom and divine judgment upon all the nations, including Edom.[3] This prophecy probably dates from the 4th century B.C. and reflects works of other prophets.[4] It is probable that there are parallels, representing literary affinity, with Obadiah 11 in Joel 3:3, Obadiah 15 in Joel 1:15, Obadiah 15 in Joel 3:4, Obadiah 17 in Joel 2:32, and Obadiah 17 in Joel 3:17;[5] and perhaps between Obadiah 10 and Joel 3:19c. Parallels with other prophetic books are often cited as well. Joel followed rather than preceded Obadiah,[6] and partakes of the same "Damn-Edom" thought common as a part of the Day of Yahweh concept in post-Exilic Judaism.

---

[1] Theophile J. Meek, "The Book of Lamentations, Introduction and Exegesis," (The Interpreter's Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick, in 12 volumes, New York: The Abingdon Press, 1956), VI, 34, 35.

[2] Hans-Joachim Kraus, Klagelieder ("Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament," edited by Noth, Band XX, Neukirchen: Kreis Moers, 1956), p. 78.

[3] This would give some evidence that the Edomites had moved into Southern Judah as early as the late Exilic period.

[4] William Franklin Stinespring, "Review of Norman Gottwald, Studies in Lamentations," JBL, LXXV (1956), p. 86; GKC, Paragraph 128k; in paragraph 122 h and i the right explanation and wrong translation are given. Introduction to this information came in Dr. Stinespring's class, OT 305, Spring, 1960, Duke University.

Arvid Kapelrud, in his significant work, Joel Studies,[7] sees Joel 4:19 as a reflection of the viewpoint of Jeremiah[8] toward the proposed conspiracy to rebel against Babylon in the late pre-Exilic period. Edom is mentioned along with Egypt in Joel, a fact that Kapelrud explains by contending that, although Egypt is not mentioned in Jeremiah 27:3, she was the propelling force behind the plans for the revolt.

> Although the identical accusation is brought against Egypt and Edom, scholars have constantly attempted to find various foundations

---

[1] 3:19, Hebrew, 4:19.

[2] Hebrew 3:3 through 4.

[3] 3:19, Hebrew 4:19.

[4] John A. Thompson, "The Book of Joel, Introduction and Exegesis," (The Interpreter's Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick, in 12 volumes, New York: The Abingdon Press, 1956), V, 732; Wade, WC Joel, p. lxxix f.; Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 576.

[5] Lanchester, CB Obadiah, p. 15.

[6] Supra, Chapter II, pp. 63-64.

[7] Arvid S. Kapelrud, Joel Studies (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1948: 4, Uppsala: A. B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1948), esp. pp. 172-174.

[8] Jeremiah 27:3.

for the accusation of each of the two. In reality, the foundations are perhaps identical, a solution which at any rate suggests itself as the most appropriate one. Perhaps the combination of "violence, injustice," and "shedding innocent blood," may offer the key to the problem. That חמס, perpetrated against Judah by Egypt and Edom, might very well allude to the pressure, which the prophet believes they exerted on the country to induce it to join in the revolt against the Babylonians.

The manner in which the shedding of innocent blood is spoken of does not really point to the involvement of actual war, but to the implication of definite circumstances.

The latter might be thought to be present in a war which Judah had been deluded into participating in, a war and a revolt which, according to the prophet's opinion, were unnecessary, detrimental, and dangerous to the utmost. The blood, which was shed in such a war, would to the prophet seem innocent blood.[1]

Bourke has presented an interesting and different analysis of Joel[2] in which he contends that Joel is to be understood as a dual description of the Day of Yahweh: chapters 1 and 2 as historically inspired by a purely natural catastrophe and seen as a chastisement of God's people and chapters 3 and 4 as an eschatological description, seeing the ultimate judgment and condemnation of the Gentiles and the final restoration of Israel, with Yahweh ruling from Mount Zion. He interprets 4:19 as related to 4:18 in an antithetic scheme: the fertility of Zion and Judah as against the desolation of Edom and Egypt.[3] Eschatologically, again, judgment on Edom is associated with the restoration of Judah-Israel.[4]

---

[1] Kapelrud, Joel Studies, p. 174.

[2] J. Bourke, "Le Jour de Yahvé dans Joël," Revue Biblique, LXVI (1959), 5-31, 191-212.

[3] Ibid., p. 196. Marco Treves ("The Date of Joel," VT, VII [1957]) finds nothing eschatological in the book, arguing for its unity and its composition ca. 323-285 B.C., pp. 150-155.

[4] Perhaps Egypt joins Edom here as an eschatological designation of the enemies of the Jews.

Amos 1:11, 12

The best-known of the prophetic collections of oracles condemning the nations is that in the book of Amos. The fourth of the oracles on the nations in chapters 1 and 2 is devoted to Edom.[1] In the familiar formula of denunciation in Amos, Edom is damned for ill will toward brothers, for pursuing them with the sword, and for retention of anger. The predicted punishment is, quite typically of Amos, devouring fire upon Teman and Bozrah. Kaufmann contends that the hostility of Edom against Judah was in the time of Joram of Judah (II Kings 8:20 ff.). "The cremation of Edom's king must have occurred during the war of Joram son of Ahab, Jehoshaphat, and the Edomite king against Moab (II Kgs. 3), after the defeat of the coalition."[2] Generally, serious question has been raised concerning the authenticity of this oracle.[3] In the opinion of this writer the oracle is to be assigned to the post-Exilic period in agreement with most other "Damn-Edom" material. The charges against and punishment of Edom are general and are in line with charges made elsewhere in the anti-Edom oracles in prophetic literature.

---

[1] Amos 1:11, 12.

[2] Yehezkel Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel*, translated by Moshe Greenberg (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), p. 364.

[3] Norman H. Snaith, *Amos, Part II, Translation and Notes* (Study Notes on Bible Books, London: The Epworth Press, 1946), pp. 24, 25; William Rainey Harper, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Amos and Hosea* ("International Critical Commentary," edited by S. R. Driver, C. A. Briggs, and Alfred Plummer, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1905), p. 31; Artur Weiser, *ATD Amos*, p. 88; Weiser, *The Old Testament*, p. 244; Max Löhr, *Untersuchungen zum Buch Amos* (*BZAW*, IV, Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1901), pp. 2, 3; Hughell E. W. Fosbroke, "The Book of Amos, Introduction and Exegesis," (*The Interpreter's Bible*, edited by G. A. Buttrick, in 12 volumes, New York: The Abingdon Press, 1956), VI, 782; together with these (cited by Snaith, p. 24) Wellhausen, Nowack, Cheyne, G. A. Smith, Marti, Sellin--all reject the oracle. T. H. Robinson, *The Book of Amos* (London: SPCK, 1923), p. 13; and Ernest Arthur Edghill, *The Book of Amos* ("Westminster Commentaries," edited by G. A. Cooke, London: Methuen and Company, 1914), pp. lxxii, 13, regard it as suspect. Richard S. Cripps, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Amos*, 2nd edition (London: SPCK, 1955), pp. 282, 283, defends its authenticity.

Malachi 1:2-5

The doom and destruction of Edom are spoken of in Malachi 1:2-5. This passage is generally accepted as genuine and is dated with the book of Malachi about 450 B.C.[1] The unresolved problems of Edomite history in the Exilic and post-Exilic periods give rise to circular arguments--that Malachi gives evidence that the Nabataean invasion of Seir must be dated about 450 B.C., and since this is probably what Malachi refers to the prophecy must be dated about 450 B.C. Strangely enough, the conclusions reached by such mental gymnastics are approximately correct but are so on the basis of other evidence.[2] The doom predicted on Edom by Malachi is not of the same vividness and fervor as that of other prophets. In contrast to the love Yahweh has for Jacob, he hates Esau.[3] His country is laid waste, and, if he tries to rebuild it, it will be destroyed again. The Edomites will be known as the people with whom Yahweh was angry unto hidden ages. The evidence that the reference of Malachi is to the Nabataean encroachment is found in: "I have . . . left his heritage to jackals of the desert."[1] Seir is usually referred to as hill country; the Nabataean invaders would be desert people. Verse 5 indicates the rejoicing of the Jews upon their vindication in this revenge-satisfying blow which fell upon Edom.

---

[1] W. Emery Barnes, The Book of Malachi ("Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges," edited by A. F. Kirkpatrick, Cambridge: The University Press, 1917), p. xi; Robert C. Dentan, "The Book of Malachi, Introduction and Exegesis," (The Interpreter's Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick, in 12 volumes, New York: The Abingdon Press, 1956), VI, 1117, 1118; J. M. Powis Smith, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Malachi ("International Critical Commentary," edited by S. R. Driver, C. A. Briggs, and Alfred Plummer, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912), pp. 5-9; Weiser, ATD Malachi, pp. 188, 189.

[2] Better evidence for dating is the reference to "governor" in 1:8 and the evidence of a completed temple. See Smith, ICC Malachi, pp. 5-9; Weiser, The Old Testament, p. 277; Weiser, ATD Malachi, pp. 188, 189; Th. Chary, Les Prophètes et le Culte à Partir de L'Exil (Bibliothèque de Théologie, Serie III, Théologie Biblique, Vol. III, Paris: Tournai Desclée and Company, 1955), pp. 160-162.

[3] See Robert Thomas Daniel, "An Interpretation of the Book of Malachi in the Light of Its Historical and Critical Problems" (M.A. thesis, Texas Christian University, 1941), pp. 43-45: The sense is "hated," not "loved less" in Esau's case.

Isaiah 21:11, 12

The book of the prophet Isaiah presents many problems to the interpreter in general. One of the specific instances of such problems is the material on Edom. In Proto-Isaiah references are first found to Edom in 21:11, 12. This passage is not a "Damn-Edom" passage. The verses cited make up the "Burden of Dumah." Dumah calls out from Seir inquiring about the night, perhaps of doom, to which inquiry there was no definite answer possible. "Dumah" has been the subject of inconclusive discussion. It is identified with Edom in general,[2] or with a theoretical location as a "most important centre and mart of the commerce of the desert in which Edom takes a leading part, and also as a convenient half-way halting-place on the nearest route between Edom and Babylon . . . ."[3] Perhaps Scott is correct in emending the text from משא דומה to נוֹשֵׂא מֵאֱדוֹם: from the "Burden of Dumah" to "one is lifting up his voice from Edom."[1] Gray best states the problem: "The Hebrew title, the Oracle of Dumah, presents an unsolved riddle; no important Edomite town of the name of Dumah is known, and it is wholly improbable that an oracle concerned with Edom as a whole would be named after some insignificant place."[2]

---

[1] 1:3.

[2] George L. Robinson, The Book of Isaiah, 2nd revised edition (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1954), p. 167.

[3] Charles Boutflower, The Book of Isaiah, Chapters I-XXXIX (London: SPCK, 1930), p. 167.

Isaiah 34

Chapter 34 of Proto-Isaiah requires treatment as a part of "Damn-Edom Theology," although there is no unanimity among scholars in so identifying the chapter. Widely varying dates, views of authorship, and interpretations have been given this poem. G. L. Robinson dates this prophecy from 701 B.C. by Isaiah of Jerusalem,[3] while Kennett goes to the opposite extreme in interpreting the poem as anonymous from the Maccabaean period, ca. 120 B.C.[4] One interesting interpretation is that of Kissane. He proposes the emendation of אדום in verse 5 to אדם : from Edom to mankind, and the deletion of the references to Edom in verse 6 as later additions. He then builds a hypothetical and unconvincing case for attributing the predicted doom to Assyria--

---

[1] R.B.Y. Scott, "The Book of Isaiah, Introduction and Exegesis," (The Interpreter's Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick, in 12 volumes, New York: The Abingdon Press, 1956), IV, 288.

[2] George Buchanan Gray, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah, I-XXXIX ("International Critical Commentary," edited by S. R. Driver, C. A. Briggs, and Alfred Plummer, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1912), p. 358.

[3] Robinson, Isaiah, p. 93.

[4] Robert H. Kennett, The Composition of the Book of Isaiah in the Light of History and Archaeology (The Schweich Lectures for 1909, London: The British Academy, 1910), pp. 67,68.

from the pen of Isaiah of Jerusalem.[1]

Chapters 34 and 35 are to be interpreted as a logical unity in which the doom and destruction of the nations, especially Edom, are contrasted with the blessedness and fertility of Judah,[2] and were probably one single oracle, but were not composed by Isaiah of Jerusalem.[3] Torrey classified chapters 34 and 35 as belonging to Deutero-Isaiah and actually as the beginning of his book. His forthright statement is:

> Chapters 34-66 of the Book of Isaiah (with the exception of 36-39, which have a different origin) form a homogeneous group and are the work of a single hand. The evidence of unity of authorship is manifold and clear. The twenty-seven poems which constitute the group were composed and written down in the order in which we now find them. Their author wrote in Palestine, presumably in Jerusalem, near the end of the fifth century B.C.[4]

Chapter 34 is interpreted by Scott as a late addition to the text of Isaiah, but before the addition of 40-66.[5] The conclusion is drawn that the poems in chapters 34 and 35 are closely related to Deutero-Isaiah in thought if not in point of composition.[6] Curt Kuhl contends that the universal judgment idea of the little apocalypse (chapters 34 and 35) is

---

[1] Edward J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah*, revised edition (in 2 volumes, Dublin: Browne and Nolan, Ltd., 1960), I, 368-373.

[2] G. W. Wade, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah* ("Westminster Commentaries," edited by Locke, London: Methuen and Company, 1911), p. 215; I. W. Slotki, *Isaiah* ("Soncino Books of the Bible," London: The Soncino Press, 1949), p. 159; Scott, *IB Isaiah*, pp. 354, 358; Charles Cutler Torrey, *The Second Isaiah, A New Interpretation* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1928), p. 93.

[3] Pro: Wade, *WC Isaiah*, p. 215; Torrey, *Second Isaiah*, p. 93; Lods, *Histoire*, p. 379. Con: Scott, *IB Isaiah*, p. 358.

[4] Torrey, *Second Isaiah*, p. 53.

[5] Scott, *IB Isaiah*, p. 160.

[6] Johann Fischer, *Das Buch Isaias* ("Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testamentes," edited by Feldmann und Herkenne, Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1937), I, 220.

> particularised and narrowed down to apply to Edom. Yahweh's sword, sated with blood, shall mow down and slaughter Edom. It will be a day of vengeance and retribution whose end shall be Edom's utter devastation and desolation. The customary corollary and obvious sequel of this judgment is seen in the familiar concept of the return of the redeemed from the diaspora and their everlasting joy on Mount Zion. The threat against Edom is so explicit in nature that it is to be taken as the redaction of some earlier oracle against foreign nations. The phraseology is evidence of the writer's dependence on Deutero-Isaiah, but the content is so alien to his way of thinking that it is highly doubtful whether it can be attributed to him.[1]

These poems are later than Isaiah of Jerusalem, probably belonging to the very early post-Exilic period, but are earlier than Maccabaean times.

The literary beauty and quality of chapter 34 are often unrecognized or ignored. The poem is indeed, as Scott says, "a striking literary composition, carefully worked out in arrangement and details. . . ."[2] An inestimable service has been rendered the interpretation and appreciation of this chapter by James Muilenburg in his article, "The Literary Character of Isaiah 34."[3] Dr. Muilenburg points out in detail the finely construed elements of parallelism and euphony throughout the poem. In painstakingly careful construction the four expressions introduced by כי show the four themes of section 1 of the poem: (1) the wrath of Yahweh (2-4), (2) the sword of Yahweh (5-6d), (3) the sacrifices of Yahweh (6e-7), and (4) the Day of Yahweh (8-9). The second section of the poem (10-17) is also carefully constructed, but the evidences of structure are not externally apparent as in part 1.[4] The careful analysis of Muilenburg's arguments is beyond the scope of this study.[5] Certain of his conclusions, however, are significant for the subject here considered.

---

[1] Kuhl, Prophets of Israel, pp. 178, 179.

[2] Scott, IB Isaiah, p. 160.

[3] James Muilenburg, "The Literary Character of Isaiah 34," JBL, LIX (1940), 339-365.

[4] Ibid., pp. 344, 354.

[5] For literary characteristics see ibid., pp. 347 ff.

Both Muilenburg and Scott (who follows Muilenburg) interpret Isaiah 34 as an eschatological poem, of uncertain but late date. Serious questions are raised by them as to whether this oracle spoke of condemnation for historical Edom. Perhaps, they would suggest, condemnation is decreed here for the enemies of Judah, "all the nations" of verse 2,[1] for which the name "Edom" is only a symbol.[2]

That there are mythological elements in abundance in this poem is obvious, and that it belongs in the general classification of eschatological literature is not argued. The form of the poem itself suggests that doom to the nations is the theme and that the mention of Edom in verses 5 and 6 is a device of parallelism, Edom for the nations. How, then, does this relate to "Damn-Edom Theology"? The author wrote at a time when the "Damn-Edom" oracles were a current and accepted part of Jewish literature. He wrote an eschatological poem about the catastrophic end of the nations in the Day of Yahweh; and he used the figure of Edom and her destruction, so well known from "Damn-Edom Theology," to depict what was to happen on that day to the nations of the world.[3] The chapter is not "Damn-Edom Theology" in a historical sense. "Damn-Edom Theology" has taken on the garments of escahtological and, to a small degree, apocalyptic thought. The usage of "Edom" as a symbol for "the enemy" continues, being used in post-Biblical Jewish writings as a designation for

---

[1] Scott, IB Isaiah, pp. 354, 355; Muilenburg, "Isaiah 34," p. 348.

[2] Torrey, Second Isaiah, pp. 122-124.

[3] Cf. ibid., p. 123. Note should be made that while much of Torrey's interpretation of this passage is accepted as valid, his dating (ca. 400 B.C.) is rejected in favor of an earlier date. See C. R. North, "The Interpretation of Deutero-Isaiah," Interpretationes Ad Vetus Testamentum (Oslo: Land og Kirke, 1955), pp. 133-145.

Rome, the current enemy.[1]

The doom, destruction, and desolation which are ascribed to Edom in this magnificent poem show that, while there were new developments, "Damn-Edom Theology" was not losing its intensity by the time of this writing. The description of the slaughter of the inhabitants[2] is blood-curdling and vengeful in its picturesque expressions. The devastation and resultant emptiness of the land are portrayed in vivid and striking pictures, e.g., "They shall name it 'No Kingdom There.'"[3] Isaiah 34 shows an interesting and significant development in "Damn-Edom Theology," dating probably from the end of the 6th century B.C. or a little later.[4]

Isaiah 63:1-6

Isaiah 63:1-6 has much in common with chapter 34. In it Yahweh is pictured as coming from Edom,[5] where he has completed a mighty destruction and slaughter, with his garments red with bloodstains. This dramatic poem also belongs to Jewish eschatological literature. It depicts the judgment of

---

[1] C. G. Montefiore and H. Loewe, A Rabbinic Anthology (Greenwich Editions by Meridian Books, n.d.), p. 562; Bewer, ICC Obadiah, p. 14. Cf. supra, Chapter I, p. 48, fn. 2.

[2] Verses 5-8.

[3] Verse 12.

[4] S. R. Driver's view that the vividness of the condemnation demands a date very near the inhuman action of the Edomites upon the fall of Jerusalem (thus Exilic) is lacking in support. Were such demanded, some specific charge concerning the conduct of the Edomites on that fateful day would have been included by the writer. Introduction, pp. 225, 226.

[5] Attempts have been made to emend "Edom" and "Bozrah" to "red" and "vintager." These are conjectural and in the opinion of the writer are not to be accepted. See Muilenburg, IB Isaiah, p. 726.

Yahweh upon those who incur his wrath, i.e., the enemies of his people.[1] Perhaps Edom here is thought of as the place of the eschatological judgment of Yahweh. This passage belongs to a later time but to the same general thought as does chapter 34.

Psalm 137

The expression of "Damn-Edom Theology" was not the exclusive property of the prophets. Psalm 137 gives one of the most repulsive expressions of condemnation of Edom found anywhere. The Psalm is obviously represented in verse 1 as Exilic in date, and there is no good reason to remove it far from that time.[2] It is either Exilic or early post-Exilic. The Psalm is to be classified among the Imprecatory Psalms[1] and the Psalms of National Lament.[2] Mowinckel says that such a regularly repeated psalm of lamentation as this Psalm borders on the ordinary psalm of prayer. "Like the ancient Psalms of lamentation, Ps. 137 in particular, has the character of a lamentation over an actual enemy (Edom), but apart from this it is an example of the introduction of an originally and personally felt feature into the traditional style."[3]

---

[1] John Skinner, Isaiah (in 2 volumes, "Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges," edited by Kirkpatrick, Cambridge: The University Press, 1917), II, 214; Torrey, Second Isaiah, p. 426.

[2] W. Stewart McCollough and William R. Taylor, "The Book of Psalms, Introduction and Exegesis," (The Interpreter's Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick, in 12 volumes, New York: The Abingdon Press, 1955), IV, 703, 704; and Charles Augustus Briggs and Emilie Grace Briggs, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms (in 2 volumes, "International Critical Commentary," edited by S. R. Driver, C. A. Briggs, and Alfred Plummer, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1906), II, 485, both agree with this conclusion. Hans-Joachim Kraus, Psalmen ("Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament," edited by Noth, in 2 volumes, Neukirchen: Kreis Moers, 1960), II, 904-908; A. F. Kirkpatrick, The Book of Psalms ("Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges," Cambridge: The University Press, 1902), p. 780, accept an early post-Exilic date, as do Artur Weiser, Psalms, translated by Herbert Hartwell ("The Old Testament Library," Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962), pp. 794-796; W.O.E. Oesterley, The Psalms (London: SPCK, 1953), p. 545. Sigmund Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, translated by D. R. Ap-Thomas (in 2 volumes, New York: The Abingdon Press, 1962), II, 156, dates this psalm "prior to 400 B.C." Bernhard Duhm, Die Psalmen ("Kurzer Hand-Kommentar zum Alten Testament," edited by Marti, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1922), p. 453, dates it in the post-Exilic period in relation to Obadiah. Thomas Kelly Cheyne, The Origin and Religious Content of the Psalter (The Bampton Lectures, 1889, New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1892), pp. 69, 70, argues unconvincingly that the psalm comes from the time of Simon Maccabee.

Strophe 1 (1-3) is a lament on conditions in the Exile. Strophe 2 (4-6) is a combination of lament and curse called upon the writer if he should forget Jerusalem. Strophe 3 (7-9)[4] is a curse pronounced upon Edom for their glee in and encouragement of the destruction of Jerusalem (and upon Babylon, as the text stands, the destroyer of the city), as well as a call for vengeance: happy is the one who repays her foul deeds, such as by taking the Edomite and/or Babylonian children (sucklings) and smashing their heads against the rock. Mowinckel says that these last three verses show Psalm 137 to be also a cursing psalm, a prayer for Edom,

---

[1] Hardly the only one in the Psalter as claimed by Taylor, _IB Psalms_, p. 703. See Pfeiffer, _Introduction to the Old Testament_, pp. 638, 639; Kirkpatrick, _CB Psalms_, pp. lxxxviii-xciii; A. R. Johnson, "The Psalms," _The Old Testament and Modern Study_, edited by Rowley (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), p. 180: classed as _mischungen_ in Gunkel's analysis.

[2] Mowinckel, _Psalms_, I, 221.

[3] _Ibid_.

[4] Verse 8 is probably a later gloss. The omission of the verse will leave three pentrametric tetrastichs. The verse intrudes on the theme that condemns the offender, Edom. Briggs, _ICC Psalms_, II, 485. Weiser, _Psalms_, p. 796, interprets the entire psalm as "Damn-Babylon" thought. As the text stands the psalm condemns both Edom and Babylon. Oesterley, _Psalms_, pp. 547-548, accepts the presence of condemnation of both nations since both were involved in the 587 B.C. destruction. He interprets the babes dashed against the rock as referring to Babylon, contending that here the author has reverted to his main theme.

> whom the Jews hated with all their hearts--to be overtaken by all sorts of disasters. The prayer arises out of the background of the bitter memory of the fall of Jerusalem, when the Edomites seized the opportunity of settling in southern Judea. The prayer finally passes into a direct curse in particularly refined form, namely as a word of blessing on the person who shall inflict the most cruel revenge on Edom.[1]

This passage is accepted as referring to Edom rather than to Babylon. The reference of the final thought in the Psalm is to the extermination, especially of the male offspring, thus wiping out the line forever.[2]

There are other brief references to Edom in words of deprecation in the Psalter: 60:8, 9 (identical with 108:9, 10) and 83:6. These brief notices add nothing to the understanding of "Damn-Edom Theology" except to witness to its ubiquitous presence in Judaic thought of the Exilic and post-Exilic periods.

Conclusion

The broad concept of the peculiar position of Israel-Judah in the post-Exilic period: they are to be blessed while the rest of the nations are doomed, is of the same theological pattern as is the damning of Edom. But the anti-Edom bias in Old Testament religion stands apart from the broad concept by virtue of its numerous expressions, its vehemence, and its particular emphasis upon one nation. Its presence, vehemence, and emphasis are found in almost every type of Hebrew canonical literature, its absence in the wisdom literature being noticeable. It was primarily a prophetic concept, at least in origin; but it came to encompass Jewish life and thought to the extent that it became the ready expression for the enemy of God's people.

---

[1] Mowinckel, Psalms, II, 52.

[2] Briggs, ICC Psalms, p. 586; Taylor, IB Psalms, p. 707. The same idea, that of dashing infants to pieces, is found in Isaiah 13:16, as a part of an oracle against Babylon.

Chapter III

JERUSALEM--485 B.C. ?

Professor Julian Morgenstern has contributed to Biblical scholarship a lengthy series entitled "Jerusalem--485 B.C."[1] which must be considered in this study of "Damn-Edom Theology." Initially it is noted that Morgenstern seems to stand alone, at least in published sources, in the view he holds.[2] Almost nothing has been said in print about Morgenstern's view--and that restricted to an occasional reference or a non-committal word of review. After careful reading of this work of Morgenstern, this student came to feel that Morgenstern was either a "crackpot" or a true genius--and uncertain as to which was true.

Morgenstern's point of departure is the story of Nehemiah at the court of the king in Susa.[3] Accepting ca. 444 B.C. as the date of Nehemiah and 586 B.C.[4] as the date of the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem, he wonders why Nehemiah was so saddened at the report of the devastated condition of Jerusalem. He argues that Jerusalem should not have been and, indeed, was not desolate all this time, but that after her rebuilding and repopulation another and later disaster befell the city. To this later event Nehemiah's grief must be related. According to Morgenstern, this catastrophe occurred in the year of the accession of Xerxes to the throne of Persia.[1] In the presence of an attempted revolt in Jerusalem led by the Nationalist party, permission was given by Xerxes to the Edomites, Moabites, Ammonites, Philistines, Tyrians, and Sidonians, i.e., the small neighboring states, to raise armies and join, probably with a small contingent from the Persian army, against Judah. Judah, mistakenly confident that Yahweh would give her the victory, fell before this overpowering onslaught; Jerusalem (including the Second Temple) was destroyed; and most of her people were enslaved and dispersed. Thus only a small remnant of those left from this captivity and dispersion were inhabiting the land. This is but a brief résumé of the position taken by Morgenstern which must now be more carefully examined.

---

[1] Julian Morgenstern, "Jerusalem--485 B.C." *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXVII (1956), 101-179; XXVIII (1957), 15-47; XXXI (1960), 1-29.

[2] His position has remained unchanged to the present. See Morgenstern, *The Fire Upon the Altar* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1963), esp. p. 3.

[3] Nehemiah 1:1-3.

[4] Morgenstern dates the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. His dating is used in reference to his arguments in this chapter. 587 B.C. is generally accepted today as the accurate date. See D. Winton Thomas, editor, *Documents from Old Testament Times* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1958), pp. 80, 81.

The beginning point in the argument of Morgenstern is the attitude of Nehemiah upon hearing of the sad plight of Jerusalem ca. 445/4 B.C.[2] Both Morgenstern[3] and H. H. Rowley[4] are correct in saying that Nehemiah was not weeping over hearing of the 587/6 B.C. destruction of Jerusalem. That condition of the city had been known for 140 years, and Nehemiah had known of it all of his life.[5] The words of Hanani in his report to Nehemiah indicated a calamity in Jerusalem, not simply a continued bad condition. The wording of his report and the reaction of Nehemiah do, indeed, demand that some recent calamity had befallen the city of Jerusalem.[1] Morgenstern has plausibly surmised that Nehemiah was expecting, or at least hoping for, a report of different content.[2] However, it does not necessarily follow that the Edomites and others in 485 B.C. destroyed a rebuilt Jerusalem.

---

[1] 486 / 485 B.C.

[2] Nehemiah 1:1-3.

[3] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 101.

[4] Harold Henry Rowley, "Nehemiah's Mission," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXXVII (1955), 529.

[5] See also Loring W. Batten, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the

Morgenstern contends that Jerusalem had come to be once more a prosperous city between 586 B.C. and 445/4 B.C.[3] Primary evidence is derived from Psalm 48.[4] With typical candor Morgenstern argues:

> Ps. 48, granting that it comes from the period 516-485 B.C., proves conclusively that during this period not only was Jerusalem inhabited, but also that it must have been a city of not a little wealth and grandeur, with majestic buildings and even encompassed by a turreted wall,[5] precisely as we would expect of a city which was the metropolis of a Persian province or subprovince and the center of the ritual practice of Judaism, the residence of its officiating priesthood, and the goal of the annual festival pilgrimages of Jews from various foreign lands.[6]

Perhaps the significant statement in the above quotation is "granting that it [Ps. 48] comes from the period 516-485 B.C." Morgenstern refers in this statement to another article he has written, "Psalm 48,"[7] in which the date,

---

Books of Ezra and Nehemiah ("International Critical Commentary," edited by C. A. Briggs, S. R. Driver, and Alfred Plummer, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913), pp. 184, 185.

[1] But why was Nehemiah weeping over a 40-year-old event? See infra, Chapter III, pp. 112, 113.

[2] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 102. [3] Ibid., pp. 102, 103.

[4] Julian Morgenstern, "Psalm 48," HUCA, XVI (1941), 1-95.

[5] The question of the destruction of the walls of Jerusalem in 485 B.C. is solvable archaeologically and should be solved in the next ten years. For this conclusion the author is indebted to Professor John Strugnell.

[6] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 102, 103.

[7] Morgenstern, HUCA, XVI (1941), 1-95.

unity, and interpretation of this Psalm are discussed. There he takes exception to the usual interpretation of Psalm 48 in that he divides the psalm into 48A (verses 2-4, 9-15) and 48B (verses 5-8). 48B is interpreted--without doubt by Morgenstern--[1] as referring to the destruction of a considerable portion of the Persian fleet of Xerxes prior to the battle of Artemisium in 480 B.C.[2] Morgenstern also argues that these verses "must be practically coincident with the event which they describe."[3] Ezekiel 27:1-3aα , 3bβ-8, 26-36 or, in Morgenstern's terminology, Ezekiel 27A, is interpreted as referring to this same historical event, and "seems . . . to confirm our interpretation of Ps. 48B."[4]

Psalm 48A (verses 2-4, 9-15) is dated ca. 500 B.C. upon the basis of internal evidence:

> . . . the Ps. depicts Jerusalem as a city of dignity and beauty, with a wall, with palaces and towers, and, above all else, with the Temple standing. Moreover, the Ps. breathes a spirit of quiet confidence and security. There is a deep conviction that the city and the people enjoy Yahweh's favor, that all is well with it and that its future is assured. There is no occasion for worry or for questioning Yahweh's power or his benevolent intentions toward His city and nation.[5]

The times when such conditions would fit are, in the pre-Exilic period: (1) the period between the Deuteronomic reformation and the death of Josiah, (2) the latter period of Solomon's reign, and (3) the time of prosperity under Uzziah. Morgenstern proceeds to rule out all three of these: (1) Josiah's time, with vassalage to Assyria, cannot furnish the setting, especially of satisfaction with the present and confidence in the future, demanded by the psalm; (2) in the time of Solomon the temple did not hold the lofty position ascribed to it here; and (3) while Uzziah's time is the most likely pre-Exilic date, in an age dominated by a king like Uzziah, the psalm, if from that time, would have made unmistakable and specific references to the king.[1] The argument presented in point (1) is reasonable and valid; in points (2) and (3) Morgenstern is begging the question. He is nearer the truth when, in the opening statement of his argument, he describes the time as "an age . . . of which we know all too little . . . ."[2] His argument would have been better founded if upon this basis he had claimed this as a possible but uncertain date and had proceeded to seek one possible and more certain. Adequate historical settings of the post-Exilic period are: (1) immediately following the completion and dedication of the second temple, ca. 516 B.C. until 485 B.C.,[3] or (2) following the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem by Nehemiah in ca. 444 B.C. The latter period is rejected because of the devastated character of the city of Jerusalem in the time following Nehemiah, making the description of the city and the attitudes toward it reflected in the psalm unlikely in this time. Thus the conclusion as to the period is narrowed by Morgenstern to 516-485 B.C.--more specifically to ca. 500 B.C., allowing time for the development of the attitudes reflected in the Psalm.[4]

---

[1] Morgenstern, *HUCA*, XVI (1941), u.

[2] Described by Herodotus in vii, 188, 190, 191.

[3] Morgenstern, *HUCA*, XVI (1941), 8.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

[5] *Ibid*., p. 23.

At this point it seems necessary to direct a criticism at Morgenstern. He is guilty here, as he will be shown to be elsewhere, of arguing in circles--from Morgenstern back to Morgenstern. In "Jerusalem--485 B.C." he accepts the conclusions of his article, "Psalm 48," which are to a definite and considerable extent based upon his hypothesis of a 485 B.C. calamity to Jerusalem.[1] Thus there appears a developing pattern of interpretations by Morgenstern, but almost exclusively supported by Morgenstern, which add together to revamp post-Exilic Old Testament history into a history radically different from that usually accepted, and from that openly presented in the Biblical records.

---

[1] Morgenstern, HUCA, XVI (1941), 23, 24.

[2] Ibid., p. 24.

[3] Morgenstern gives no explanation of or evidence for the prior rebuilding of the walls.

[4] Morgenstern, HUCA, XVI (1941), 24, 25.

There is no compelling reason, in spite of Morgenstern's arguments, for the partitioning of Psalm 48. It is granted that there is no striking unanimity in the dating and interpretation of the psalm, but the same could be said of many pieces in the Psalter. Morgenstern has overstepped the bounds of reasonable analysis in saying:

> Manifestly this wide latitude of interpretation results mainly from the almost self-evident fact that vv. 5-8 seem to have little in common with the thought and spirit of the remainder of the Ps. And it has become clear that it is only by forcing the meaning of either the one or the other of these two sections of the Ps., only by reading into them much that is either not present there at all or else that can be conceived only with the help of an exceedingly fertile imagination, can any plausible harmony and unity of thought between them be achieved.[2]

The primary basis of his argument seems to be that verses 2-4 and 9-15 can be fitted together and make perfectly good sense without the insertion of verses 5-8. It is almost unnecessary to point out that by such a standard of judgment innumerable passages, especially in the Psalter, could be considered interpolations. In fact, the insertion of verses 5-8 make the psalm more vivid and meaningful as illustrative of the power and might of Yahweh.[3] The unity of

---

[1] At the time of the writing of "Psalm 48" the study of "Jerusalem--485 B.C." had not been published, and, perhaps, not completely worked out.

[2] Morgenstern, HUCA, XVI (1941), 4.

[3] The references in verses 5-8 are not to the events of 701 B.C.; they are to apocalyptic events (see Weiser, Psalms, pp. 381-383). Mowinckel de-

Psalm 48 is assumed or accepted without serious question by practically all scholars who discuss it.[1]

The fact that Morgenstern stands alone in his interpretation does not mean that he is wrong, but that he stands on no better reasons than he can muster to support his partition of Psalm 48 reflects serious doubt on his position. The psalm may be considered as a unity and without serious objection as a hymn to the glory of Yahweh, perhaps used cultically in the Covenant Festival of Yahweh which was celebrated in the temple at Jerusalem.[2] Accept-

---

scribes Psalm 48 as "quasi-historical, but events like those described--the nations' attack on Jerusalem, and their rout and destruction there--never happened in actual history." Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, I, 110.

[1] W.O.E. Oesterley, The Psalms, pp. 260-264; Edward J. Kissane, The Book of Psalms (Dublin: Browne and Nolan, Ltd., 1953), pp. 208-211; Weiser, Psalms, pp. 379-384; Duhm, Die Psalmen, pp. 195-198; Kraus, Psalmen, I, 355-361; Aubrey R. Johnson, "The Role of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus," in The Labyrinth, edited by S. H. Hooke (London: SPCK, 1935), pp. 92-95; Hermann Gunkel, Einleitung in die Psalmen ("Handkommentar zum Alten Testament," Göttingen: Vanderhoeck und Ruprecht, 1933), pp. 80-83; Sigmund Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien, in two volumes (Amsterdam: P. Schipper, 1961), I, 6-12, 126 ff.; Kirkpatrick, CB Psalms, pp. 262-267; Briggs, ICC Psalms, I, 400-404; Taylor, IB Psalms, pp. 249-254.

[2] Weiser, Psalms, p. 380; Weiser discusses this "Covenant Festival" in which Yahweh is enthroned on the cherubim in pp. 23-35 of the same work. Mowinckel says the conception that " . . . Yahweh has secured his kingdom and his enthronement by coming and delivering his people and his city from a threatening attack by the united kings and nations of the world . . ." is found in Psalm 48. "Here the idea of Yahweh's historic and ever repeated victory over the 'nations,' and the confidence engendered by these experiences and the faith on which they were based, is presented as an epic tale woven around a mythically tinted happening. The 'happening' to which the psalms [46, 48, 75, 76] allude along with its corresponding 'tale' is an attack on Jerusalem by all the kings and nations of the earth; but just when the distress is at its height Yahweh appears and crushes them all; so the walls of Jerusalem are safe, the 'City of the Great King' stands unshaken. This hardly refers to any single historical event, as earlier interpreters of the psalms used to think, nor is it meant to be a description of what is going to take place in the 'latter days,' in eschatological times. It is described as something just experienced, something the congregation 'itself has seen' (Ps. 48: 9). But at the same time it is something it 'has heard of' before. Here, too, the explanation is that there is a reference to the realities of faith being

ance of the unity of the psalm does not demand an artificial tying together of divergent parts:

> Verse 3 as well as vv. 8 and 9 point to an event that has taken place in the cult and finds its hymnic response in the testimony to the greatness of God borne by those who attend the feast (vv. 1-11); meanwhile, the call made upon them by a priest to walk in procession around the holy city is to be understood in connection with the cultic ceremony. The exclusive interpretation of the psalm in the light of contemporary history, relating it mostly to the deliverance of Jerusalem from the Assyrians in 701 B.C. is disproved by the lack of any specific allusions to a thanksgiving service; and an exclusively eschatological interpretation can be justified only if the tenses are disregarded which point to events that have immediately preceded the psalm. The historical as well as the eschatological features of the psalm are rather to be accounted for by the fact that they have their place in the festival cult.[1]

There is no unanimity in dating the psalm. Weiser argues that: "There are no cogent reasons which would exclude the view that the psalm was composed and used in pre-exilic times."[2] Briggs contends for a dating in "the late Persian times."[3] Duhm would bring the psalm to the beginning of or immediately before the Maccabaean period.[4] The present investigator would contend

---

re-experienced as repeated reality in the cult. What has taken place, and always will take place, in faith is presented by the cultic myth as an 'ideal' supra-worldly reality in the epic form of a once-only event. In an 'ideal' and real sense it is repeated whenever Yahweh appears as king, victorious in the festival. It is being ensured to faith as something that is also going to happen in political and empirical reality, should the 'nations' or any specific nation be so presumptuous as to attack Yahweh's city. Here we have a version of the 'cultic myth' of the festival, which we call the *myth about the fight of nations*." Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, I, 151, 152.

[1] Weiser, *Psalms*, pp. 380, 381.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 381.

[3] Briggs, *ICC Psalms*, I, 401.

[4] Duhm, *Die Psalmen*, p. 198. There is serious doubt that this or any other psalm is to be dated from the Maccabaean period. Evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls indicates that by ca. 150 B.C. the Psalter was essentially fixed as it is today. That there were Maccabaean interpolations may be true, but the dating of psalms as Maccabaean must be considered suspect. Weiser, *Psalms*, pp. 91, 92; W. F. Albright, "The Old Testament and the Archaeology of Palestine," in *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, edited by H. H. Rowley (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), pp. 24, 25.

that there are no clear indications of a closely defined date for the psalm. A date in the post-Exilic period after the rebuilding of the temple and city walls of Jerusalem is to be preferred.

One basic criterion of the dating Morgenstern gives Psalm 48 is to be found in its relation to the post-Exilic Jewish doctrine of "for His name's sake." This doctrine was developed by Ezekiel as an answer to the paradox inherent in the restoration hope of the Exilic community.

> . . . how was it possible to reconcile the concept of Yahweh as a God of complete and perfect justice and righteousness in His dealings with men, and particularly with Israel, His people, with the quite antithetical concept of His complete forgiveness of His people, still recognizedly and confessedly sinful and faithless?[1]

The answer to this paradox was that it was possible that Yahweh could so deal with his people "for His name's sake." Israel, in a sense, has Yahweh in a corner. Yahweh is the universal God, but he is not known and revered universally--only by Israel. Thus, in order that he might be known and worshipped universally, he had to care for these sinful and rebellious people who are known as "His people."

> Even though Israel is still a faithless people, steeped in sin and even though this fact is clearly known both to Him and to it, and even though it has not become regenerate in any way, nor in the slightest degree of its own accord merited forgiveness, none the less Yahweh must forgive it and restore it to its land and to national existence and take it again as His people and prosper it in the sight of all the nations, in order that their suspicions may be dispelled and they may come to realize that He is indeed a great and powerful deity, a world-god in every respect, that not only can He protect and prosper His own particular, little people, but likewise He can work judgments and execute punishments throughout the world, upon those nations which will not recognize Him and His power and dominion and will not do homage to Him and revere His holy name. For the sake of His name, for the sake of His reputation among the nations, He must act. He must of His own volition, as a manifestation of sheer grace, forgive Israel all its sins and take it again unto Himself as His people.[2]

---

1. Morgenstern, HUCA, XVI (1941), 29. 2. Ibid., p. 33.

Yahweh will give his people a "new heart" with which they will respond to God and ever follow in his ways. Then will all the nations see the greatness, might, justice, and goodness of Yahweh. This is the basic content of Ezekiel's doctrine of "for His name's sake," which itself grows out of Jeremiah's doctrine of the "new covenant." The doctrine so formulated was to have great influences on succeeding generations. There are many passages, according to Morgenstern, in subsequent Old Testament literature which contain this doctrine.[1]

Verse 11 of Psalm 48 is interpreted by Morgenstern as proclaiming this doctrine:

> Even as Thy name, so also Thy praise
> (Doth reach) to the ends of the earth.[2]

His argument follows this course: Yahweh's name is known and honored throughout the world; thus the goal of Ezekiel's doctrine has been realized. The psalm as a whole implies the restoration of Israel to national existence and to divine favor. The conclusion is that Psalm 48 must have come from a time when such conditions were realized, and most certainly later than Ezekiel.[3]

But Weiser would take exception, arguing that the "name of Yahweh" in this psalm and in other places in the Old Testament is to be related to the God who is thought to be present over the ark in the cultic theophany.[4] The name of God was the equivalent of the presence of God himself to the Hebrews. Granting, for the moment, the basic validity of Morgenstern's analysis of the "for His name's sake" doctrine developing especially in Deutero-Isaiah and

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 34-36. A listing of these passages includes: Psalms 106:8; 79:9, 10; 115:1 ff.; 98:2-4; 66:1-4; 23:3; 25:11; 31:4; 109:21; 143:11; Numbers 14:15-19; Joel 2:17b; I Kings 8:41-43 (and II Chronicles 6:32, 33); Isaiah 48:9-11.

[2] Morgenstern, HUCA, XVI (1941), 37.

[3] Ibid., p. 38.

[4] Weiser, Psalms, p. 42.

Ezekiel, there is no reason to contend that Psalm 48:11 proclaims the full development of this doctrine, or even that it proclaims this Ezekielian doctrine. The verse would seem to indicate thought of Yahweh as more universal than tribal, thus suggesting the post-Exilic period. The idea of the name of God was present and significant in Israel from the earliest times of the covenant-nation.[1]

A further argument set forth by Morgenstern for the dating of Psalm 48 is its inclusion of the doctrine of Yahweh as Universal King. He finds this doctrine a post-Exilic one, coming after the establishment of a theocracy, after the time of Zerubbabel, and one built upon Ezekiel's teaching and expanded by Deutero-Isaiah.[2] The clinching argument is seen in Malachi 1:11, 14b, in which Yahweh is described as the "Universal King." Morgenstern, in dating these verses, says that they are "a prophetic utterance coming undoubtedly from the period between 500 and 490 B.C."[3] This dating is assigned upon the basis of "cogent reasons"[4] which are found in his interpretation of a 485 B.C. catastrophe to Judah, but which he does not state in this discussion. The relationship with Psalm 48 is primarily between מלך גדול [5] and מלך רב ,[6] and more generally between the common thought of Yahweh as Universal King. Morgenstern hastens to the conclusion:

> And inasmuch as we have already had cumulative evidence that the Ps.

---

[1] William Claudius Strickland, "The Meaning of the Name of God in Biblical Theology" (unpublished Th.D. thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 1953), pp. 100-173; especially pp. 168-170 on the subject in Ezekiel.

[2] Morgenstern, *HUCA*, XVI (1941), 38-43.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 44.

[4] Ibid., p. 44, with references to *HUCA*, XXVIII (1957), 15-47.

[5] Malachi 1:14b.

[6] Psalm 48:3.

> must be later than Ezekiel, what conclusion can be more natural and logical than to regard it as contemporaneous with this earliest utterance of Malachi and assign it to the period 500-490 B.C.?[1]

In a discussion of some forty pages Morgenstern deals with the term ירכתי צפון in verse 3 of Psalm 48 as giving additional evidence to support his view concerning this psalm. ירכתי צפון is usually translated "in the far north,"[2] or "on the northern ridge."[3] צפון is a reference, attested to in other Semitic parallels, to the throne of the great god on the topmost of a series of seven mountains at the northernmost edge of the world.[4] This psalm is proclaiming that the great universal deity, Yahweh, has Mount Zion as his ירכתי צפון . This is thus an enthronement psalm, proclaiming the recurrent annual enthronement on Mount Zion of the mighty king.[5]

Morgenstern's conclusion, obviously in mind from the beginning and duly reached, is that Psalm 48 is from the period ca. 500 B.C. and can be from no other period. But Morgenstern has failed to support satisfactorily the arguments by which he reached these conclusions as to the date of the Psalm. He is incorrect in saying that the psalm can come from no other period. There is nothing in the psalm which enables one to date it precisely. To argue on the basis of this psalm and its dating that Jerusalem was a rebuilt and splendid city before Nehemiah wept over its ruined condition ca. 444 B.C. and, thus, to rewrite post-Exilic Old Testament history is sheer nonsense. Without the conclusions reached by Morgenstern on the basis of his interpretation of this psalm his hypothesis concerning "Jerusalem--485 B.C." is but a limping shadow of its former self.

---

[1] Morgenstern, HUCA, XVI (1941), 47.

[2] Revised Standard Version.

[3] Briggs, ICC Psalms, I, 400.

[4] Morgenstern, HUCA, XVI (1941), 47-86. [5] Ibid., p. 87.

Nehemiah

If Jerusalem was a prosperous city, replete with walls, magnificent buildings, and a beautiful temple in the period following 516 B.C., Nehemiah must have been grieving over some later catastrophe which befell the city.[1] The question, then, is: what catastrophe befell Jerusalem between 516 and 444 B.C.?

Morgenstern finds more support for his hypothesis in the term used in Nehemiah: "The remnant which were left from the captivity."[2] Traditionally and almost universally this has been accepted as referring to the Babylonian exile, but Morgenstern says not so. And, indeed, if he is correct in his conclusions regarding Psalm 48 and his conclusions concerning the events of 485 B.C., it would be possible to identify another remnant to which reference is made here. Morgenstern further contends that this second deportation was more drastic and extensive than were the deportations made by the Babylonians.[3] Perhaps it is significant, and if it is, Morgenstern has ignored it, that Nehemiah is represented as asking about the welfare of this remnant[4] which had escaped this disaster before he knew anything about the 485 B.C. destruction and deportation of Judah's inhabitants.[5] Ignoring this, Morgenstern proceeds to take the cutting edge off some of his arguments by assuming that Nehemiah had known all along about the events of 485 B.C. and that he was upset to the point of tears because the news brought was that one of the pet projects of Nehemiah directed to the end of the restoration and rebuilding of the Holy City had utterly failed.[1] Now, if this latter portion of Morgenstern's argument be true, there seems no cogent reason for insisting that the 586 B.C. destruction of Jerusalem was too far past in time to bring tears to the eyes of Nehemiah. After all, Nehemiah was weeping because of the failure of a pet project, not over a catastrophe of destruction which had befallen Jerusalem.

---

[1] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 103.

[2] Nehemiah 1:3; Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 103. This is a strong point in Morgenstern's argument. Support is seen in the RSV translation: "the survivors . . . who escaped exile . . . ."

[3] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 103, 104.

[4] Nehemiah 1:2.

[5] Nehemiah 1:3.

Testimony to establish this second destruction of Jerusalem and the subsequent deportation is set forth by Morgenstern from various portions of the Old Testament. The testimony he presents will now be briefly considered.

Lamentations

Morgenstern suggests that in addition to moving away from the traditional view that Jeremiah wrote Lamentations, the view that the book describes the 586 B.C. destruction of Jerusalem ought to be abandoned as well. He admits that the 586 B.C. date seems to fit the contents in many ways--the destruction of Jerusalem and the capture of the king, the "Lord's anointed."[2] Appeal is made to Lamentations 1:10 in an attempt to dispose of the traditional interpretation of Lamentations:

> The enemy has stretched out his hands
>   over all her precious things;
> Yea, she has seen the nations
>   invade her sanctuary,

---

[1] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 104, 105. [2] Ibid., pp. 105, 106.

> Those whom thou didst forbid
> to enter thy congregation.[1]

Morgenstern interprets this as a reference to Deuteronomy 23:4, which decrees that no Ammonite or Moabite to the tenth generation shall enter the assembly of Yahweh. Perhaps, he suggests, the Edomites were originally included in this verse:

> There is cogent reason for believing that the Edomites were originally named in Deut. 23.4 along with the Ammonites and Moabites as nations to whom admittance into the congregation was denied forever. In fact Lam. 1.10 implies this very definitely. Ultimately, however, because of radically changed historic circumstances a very late Deuteronomic editor withdrew the mention of the Edomites from Deut. 23.4 and in its stead appended the original legislation [Deut. 23] vv. 8-9, providing for the admission of the Edomites in the third generation into the congregation of Yahweh. Those Edomites, thus admitted to the congregation of Yahweh, i.e., to the Jewish religious community, were of course the so-called Idumeans, who had settled in Southern Judaea . . . probably during the course of the second quarter of the fifth century B.C.[2]

The specific mention of Edom in Lamentations 4:21, 22 gives conclusive evidence to Morgenstern that Ammon, Moab, and Edom are the enemy in Lamentations. He concludes that the mention of these three "proves" that the occasion of Lamentations could not have been 586 B.C.

> Obviously these nations could have had no part whatever in the catastrophe which befell Jerusalem in 586 B.C. It follows then with certainty that the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple which they wrought must have been quite some other event and have transpired upon a different and certainly a later occasion.[3]

Morgenstern assumes here and throughout his arguments that Edom, Moab, and Ammon were allies of Judah in the time of the 586 B.C. destruction of

---

[1] Lamentations 1:10 (RSV).

[2] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 107, 108; but others cite the possibility that this passage antedates the anti-Edom feeling, cf. G. Ernest Wright, IB Deuteronomy, pp. 468, 469.

[3] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 108.

Jerusalem.[1] This assumption is based on the reference in Jeremiah 27:4-11 relating the meeting of representatives of Edom, Ammon, Moab, Tyre, and Sidon, along with Judah in Jerusalem ostensibly to plot the overthrow of their Babylonian overlords. This council took place ca. 589 B.C. The unified rebellion never developed, it seems.[2] There is almost no evidence upon which to base conclusions concerning the part played by the nations around Judah or their fate in the 586 B.C. Babylonian march into their area. Bright contends that only Tyre[3] and Ammon[4] were committed to the revolt with Judah. The other nations were "apparently lukewarm or hostile to the idea, with Edom even coming in finally on the side of the Babylonians . . . ."[5] The assumption of Morgenstern that Edom *et alii* were allies of Judah in 586 B.C. is not proved and must be rejected as highly unlikely in view of the meager but existing evidence.

Granting to Morgenstern that Edom is mentioned in Lamentations, she is not described as the destroyer of Jerusalem, and Ammon and Moab are not specifically mentioned. It is by no means necessary to join Lamentations 1:10 with Deuteronomy 23:4 to interpret it. Perhaps, and more probably, back of the verse in question lies the thought of, if not a literary reference to, Ezekiel 44:9: "Therefore thus says the Lord God: No foreigner, uncircumcised in heart and flesh, of all the foreigners who are among the people of Israel, shall enter my sanctuary." (RSV) Thus the reference could be to any non-Jewish people. The interpretation of Morgenstern may be granted as a possibility, but certainly his case has not been proved as he contends, and if it were, it would not follow that Jerusalem was destroyed in 485 B.C.

---

[1] Besides the above quote and concomitant passages, see Morgenstern, *HUCA*, XXXI (1961), 8.

[2] See *supra*, Chapter I, pp. 41-43.

[3] Bright, *History of Israel*, p. 308. Tyre was besieged by Nebuchadrezzar after Jerusalem fell.

[4] Bright, *History of Israel*, p. 308, based on Ezekiel 21:18-32; Jeremiah 40:13-41:15.

[5] Bright, *History of Israel*, p. 308.

The argument of the present investigator is that Morgenstern's position has been demonstrated as lacking basis in fact. Once the insistent view presented by Professor Morgenstern that Jerusalem was a prosperous, gloriously rebuilt city between 516 and 485 B.C. is discounted[1] and the argument that Edom and her allies could have had nothing to do with the 587/6 B.C. destruction of Jerusalem is found to be without basis, the foundation is removed from the hypothetical edifice erected in "Jerusalem--485 B.C." The superstructure of this edifice will now be examined, but in less detail and with less attempt to point out misinterpretations where they exist, since without the foundation the superstructure cannot stand.

Ezekiel

Morgenstern proceeds upon the assumption that he has established conclusively that Judah and Jerusalem were conquered and devastated in 485 B.C. and that this was primarily accomplished by Ammon, Moab, and Edom. Among the foreign nation oracles in Ezekiel, he accepts the oracles against Tyre and Egypt as an original nucleus by Ezekiel. In view of the conclusions already established, Morgenstern says: "Obviously the denunciations of Ammon, Moab, Edom, the Philistines, and Sidon cannot have come from Ezekiel, but must be in their entirety the work of . . . later writers, and no doubt picture a situation of their own day."[1] Basing his argument upon the absence of the mention of Nebuchadrezzar or the Babylonians or even the Persians (the B^{e}ne Kedem, "true nomads of the camel type of Bedouin,"[2] are mentioned) as instruments of punishment[3] and the postulate that these nations were allies of Judah in 586 B.C., Morgenstern concludes that these oracles against foreign nations give supporting evidence in establishing his hypothesis. He contends that approximately the following historical situation lies behind these oracles. The nations, Ammon, Moab, Edom, Philistia, Tyre, and, to an insignificant degree, Sidon, had formed a coalition and had successfully attacked Judah. The land, the city of Jerusalem, and the temple had been devastated; the vast majority of the people of Judah had been massacred; a considerable portion of the surviving remnant had been sold into slavery; and only a small fragment survived and remained in the land. This tragic catastrophe occurred between 516 B.C. (the dedication of the Second Temple) and 445/4 B.C. (Nehemiah's reference to this remnant).[4]

---

[1] See supra, Chapter III, pp. 104-106.

Obadiah and Malachi

Little use is made by Morgenstern of Obadiah. Edom was singled out as the most active and vindictive of the aligned nations in the attack upon Judah and Jerusalem. Just as Edom dealt with Judah with savage cruelty, so will Yahweh deal with Edom. The thought is furthered by Malachi 1:2-5. Yahweh, the universal God, loves Jacob but hates Edom, and he intends to destroy her. The previously predicted destruction[5] has already begun. An enemy has already attacked and destroyed some cities, but more is to come. Total destruction will befall her. These anti-Edom passages are dated from ca. 478 B.C. with the promise of later confirmation which lies in the establishment of the events of 485 B.C. and the view that these bitter words come not very long after the disaster.[1]

---

[1] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 109.

[2] Ibid., p. 111.

[3] Ibid., pp. 109-111.

[4] Ibid., pp. 113, 114.

[5] Obadiah 11-16; Ezekiel 25:12-14; 36:1-15. This is related to the

Psalms

A lengthy section of "Jerusalem--485 B.C." is devoted to the testimony from the Psalms which relates to the alleged destruction of Jerusalem by a coalition of neighboring states. The psalms discussed[2] have often been considered Maccabaean, but Morgenstern, as well as other recent interpreters, contends that these must be dated earlier.[3]

Psalm 79 is described as giving the simplest and most immediate picture. The psalm reflects a grievous catastrophe which had befallen Jerusalem. Significant in Morgenstern's interpretation are the references to "our neighbors" and "those round about us."[4] Careful note must be taken, however, that those who destroy Jerusalem are called only "the heathen" (גוים).[5] The reference to the "neighbors" is related to their mocking and derision directed at the Jews. Another significant element in Morgenstern's interpretation is that the Jews call upon Yahweh for help "for the glory of thy name" and for

---

Nabataean encroachment. Cf. Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 116.

[1] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 114-116.

[2] Psalms 44:10-17, 23; 60(108):3-5, 10-13; 74:1-11, 19-23; 79; 83; 137:7-9.

[3] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 117.

[4] Verse 4.

[5] Verse 1.

deliverance and forgiveness "for thy name's sake."[1]

If one can assume, although this assumption is not at all necessary, that the nations near Judah of verse 4 are to be equated with the heathen of verse 1, Morgenstern's arguments become logical; otherwise they remain no more than a possibility without probability. Morgenstern rejects the dating of Briggs[2] and others who assign an Exilic date to the psalm with the understanding that it refers to the events of 587/6 B.C.[3] The view of Gunkel,[4] that the psalm is not Exilic and does not refer to the events of the fall of Jerusalem, is accepted, but the positive portion of Gunkel's analysis, that, along with Psalm 74, this psalm must be dated sometime between Ezra and Alexander with reference to some later attempt to plunder the temple, ca. 400 B.C. in connection with the Persian-Egyptian wars, is rejected. The solution proposed by Buttenwieser,[5] that Psalms 79 and 74 are to be related to the historical background of the book of Judith[6] and are to be dated ca. 344 B.C., is rejected on the bases that nothing specific is known of a calamity to Jerusalem ca. 344 B.C., that the reference in Judith indicates that the return from the captivity and the rededication of the temple were "not long ago," that

---

[1] Verse 9.

[2] Briggs, ICC Psalms, II, 197. He notes Maccabaean glosses.

[3] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 118.

[4] Hermann Gunkel, Ausgewählte Psalmen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1917), pp. 106-108.

[5] Moses Buttenwieser, The Psalms Chronologically Treated with a New Translation (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1938), p. 611.

[6] Here suggesting that this background is the incident reported in Eusebius, Chronicon, II, 105 (J. P. Migne, ed., Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca, 161 vols. [Paris: Migne, 1857-1866], vol. XIX, but cited by Morgenstern as Chronicon, II, 112, 113) that in 344 B.C. Artaxerxes Ochus exiled and settled in Hyrcania on the Caspian Sea a part of the Jewish population. See Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 119.

"of late" cannot encompass a period of 172 years, and that the reference to the neighbors of Israel in Psalm 79:12 could not apply to Persia as a 344 B.C. interpretation would require.[1] Having thus rejected other viewpoints, Morgenstern dates these psalms in conjunction with the alleged 485 B.C. catastrophe as having come from shortly after 485 B.C.[2]

In seeking to date Psalm 79 more specifically Morgenstern appeals to Ezekiel's doctrine of "for His name's sake."[3] He argues further that certainly the psalm cannot be earlier than Ezekiel's formulation of this doctrine and that its composition cannot be too long after the formulation of this doctrine, since the doctrine is expressed "in its original form and with all its primary implications and had not yet undergone any of the later modifications . . . ."[4] The psalm must, according to Morgenstern, come later than 570 B.C. The historical events (the destruction of Jerusalem) are recorded with such vividness that the account will not permit dating far after the event. Thus he is able to reject references to 586 B.C. events. The reference to the destruction, then, forces a date after 516 B.C., and the vividness of the expression of the doctrine of "for His name's sake" in verses 9, 10, forbids a date as late as 344 B.C. as proposed by Buttenwieser.[5] The conclusion: the psalm must be interpreted and dated in relation to the alleged 485 B.C. calamity which befell Jerusalem.[6]

---

[1] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 118, 119.

[2] Ibid., p. 120.

[3] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 120-126; supra, Chapter III, pp. 108-110; Morgenstern, "Moses with the Shining Face," HUCA, II (1925), 18-20; "Psalm 48," HUCA, XVI (1941), 26-36; "Psalm 23," JBL, LXV (1946), 20 ff.; "Isaiah 63.7-14," HUCA, XXIII (1950-51), I, 201 f.

[4] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 127.

[5] Ibid., pp. 127-130.

[6] Ibid., p. 130.

Psalm 74 relates the same events as does Psalm 79 and must be similarly interpreted and dated. The attitudes of the attacking forces[1] are the attitudes and motives ascribed to the Edomites, Ammonites, Moabites, and Philistines in portions of Ezekiel 25:1-36:15, which has already been interpreted against the background of the 485 B.C. events.[2]

Psalm 83, Morgenstern says, "deals unquestionably with the same historic episode, but obviously from a moment somewhat earlier than that envisaged by both Ps. 79 and 74. The conquest and destruction have not yet begun."[3] In this psalm Morgenstern sees evidence of the formation of a coalition of nations against Judah to annihilate her and take over her territory,[4] of the doctrine of "for His name's sake,"[5] and of the Deutero-Isaianic doctrine of "Yahweh as God alone."[6] On these grounds the psalm is referred to the same event as seen in Psalms 79 and 74.[7] In Psalm 83, however, the covenanting nations are named. Edom, Moab, Ammon, Philistia, and Tyre fit in nicely with the hypothesis set forth by Morgenstern. He interprets the Ishmaelites, the Hagrites, Gebal, and Amalek as nomadic or semi-nomadic groups attaching themselves to the other nations mentioned for the purpose of achieving their common goal: the destruction of Judah.[8] Verse 8 is, to Morgenstern, a source of great difficulty: "Assyria also has joined them; they are the strong arm of the children of Lot." The children of Lot are the Ammonites and Moabites. If "Ashshûr" is to be

---

1. Verses 1-7.

2. Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 130, 131.

3. Ibid., p. 131. 4. Verses 1-5. 5. Verses 16-18.

6. Verse 18. Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 122; S. H. Blank, "Studies in Deutero-Isaiah," HUCA, XV (1940), 14-18.

7. Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 132. 8. Ibid., p. 134.

taken literally as the Assyrian kingdom, a pre-Exilic date is demanded (prior to 612 B.C.). Morgenstern cites various interpretations equating "Ashshûr" with Assyria, Syria (this the majority viewpoint), Samaria, the Ashurites, and Persia.[1] Following Ewald and Buttenwieser, Morgenstern concludes that "Ashshûr" is a cryptic name of Persia, much as Edom later became a cryptic name for Rome.[2] His position, then, is that the federation of nations described in verses 6-8 was composed of Edom, Moab, Ammon, Tyre, Philistia, along with certain nomadic or semi-nomadic tribes, and with some Persian support.[3]

Psalm 60[4] is understood by Morgenstern to refer to the same national catastrophe, but written somewhat later, looking back on the suffering and humiliation brought on by this experience, primarily at the hands of Edom, Moab, and the Philistines.[5]

In Psalm 44 further evidence is found to support the position of Morgenstern. Quite often the psalm has been regarded as Maccabaean.[6] Morgenstern dates the psalm ca. 485 B.C. His bases for this dating seem to be the mention of the taunting neighbors in verse 13, the selling of God's people, and the scattering of them among the nations.[7] No mention is made of the capture and destruction of Jerusalem or the temple. Morgenstern explains this by saying: "Perhaps then this psalm records a stage in the unfolding of Judah's national tragedy slightly earlier than that depicted in those two (74 and 79) psalms."[1] Yet it must be noted that the psalm reflects the sale of the Jews captured in this devastating attack in the slave markets of the world. Morgenstern would, thereby, explain the term used by Nehemiah, "the remnant left from the captivity."[2] The captivity (שבי), he contends, was this conquest and the selling of slaves, not an exile (גלות), which selling would be necessarily somewhat after the conquest.[3] No evidence or indication is presented that the selling of the slaves on the world market preceded the destruction of the city of Jerusalem and the temple.

---

[1] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 133.

[2] Ibid., pp. 133, 134.

[3] Ibid., p. 134.

[4] Psalm 60:5-12 = Psalm 108:6-13; Psalm 60:12 = Psalm 44:10.

[5] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 134, 135.

[6] The exceptions to this usual dating, other than Morgenstern, are Gunkel and Oesterley, post-Exilic; Briggs, late Persian; and Buttenwieser, 344 B.C. (supra, Chapter III, p. 119).

[7] Verses 11, 12.

Much more nebulous and uncertain is the attempt of Morgenstern to relate Psalm 2 to his hypothesis. He has attempted a reconstruction of the psalm.[4] He says: "At first glance there seems little in this psalm to connect it with the event in Jewish history which we are endeavoring to recover."[5] It might be added in all fairness that second and third glances suggest the same conclusion. The analysis of Morgenstern is based upon the conspiracy of nations against Judah in verses 1 and 2. The reference to the anointing of a king he interprets, not as pre-Exilic, but as dated ca. 485 B.C., when, he suggests,

> a king, an anointed one, chosen by Yahweh, and therefore presumably a descendant of David, stood in the Father-son relationship with Yahweh, even as v. 7 states specifically, was either ruling over it [Jerusalem]

---

1. Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 138.
2. Nehemiah 1:3.
3. Morgenstern, " נשקו בר ," JQR, N.S. XXXII (1942), 371-385.
4. Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 136-138.
5. Ibid., p. 139.

> and over the Jewish nation, or was at least endeavoring to establish such rule.[1]

This catastrophe came at a time when the little Jewish nation was entertaining hopes of world conquest and world dominion,[2] and this was a precipitant cause of the 485 B.C. attack upon Judah. Yet, verse 3 seems to indicate a pre-Exilic setting.

Finally from the Psalter, 137:7-9 is viewed as evidence in Morgenstern's reconstruction. He separates verses 1-6 from 7-9, dating 1-6 as shortly after either 597 B.C. or 586 B.C., with preference for the former.[3] After this interpretation he correctly interprets 7-9 as having reference to Edom. He dates these verses from the reign of Nabonidus (556-539 B.C.) in which time he made Teima, in north-central Arabia and near Edom, his residence and, in a sense, the capital of the Babylonian Empire. Thus he explains the "daughter, Babylon"[4] as referring to Teima, capital of the Babylonian Empire. His argument at this point is unnecessary.[5] The verses picture " . . . Edom's savage ruthlessness towards the conquered and helpless population of Jerusalem at the time of the great catastrophe . . . ," 485 B.C.[6]

At this point it will be well and wise to see another and probably more valid interpretation of the psalms discussed in the preceding pages. The view is that of Artur Weiser, whose conclusions as to date and occasion are summarized. Psalms 74 and 79 speak of a destruction of the temple, it is true, but there are no concrete allusions on which to ascertain whether these were composed on the occasion of the 587 B.C. fall of Jerusalem or of some later desecration of the temple which is unknown today.[1] Psalms 44 and 60 are related in subject: lamentation after a defeat of Israel. The date of this defeat and of the composition of these psalms is uncertain. A pre-Exilic date is suggested as probable.[2] Psalm 83 is better understood as having an eschatological rather than historical meaning.[3] Psalm 2 is an enthronement psalm, pre-Exilic but later than David. The language expressing the lofty position of Israel and its king was borrowed from the pattern of court ritual in the great kingdoms of the ancient Near East.[4] Psalm 137 is probably early post-Exilic in date, with verses 7-9 giving vent to pent-up rage no longer controllable.[5]

---

[1] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 141. This interpretation is made in the light of Lamentations 4:20.

[2] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 142-144.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 145.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 145, 146.

[5] See *supra*, Chapter II, p. 85.

[6] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 147. More correctly these verses describe the hatred of the Jews for the Edomites in light of something they have done in an undefined time of calamity upon Jerusalem.

Isaiah 63:15-64:12[6]

Morgenstern assigns this passage to Trito-Isaiah, contending that in thought it is dependent on both Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah.[7] The poet "records the poignant grief and almost hopeless despair of the Jewish people at the tragic fate which has befallen them."[8] The scene is one in which the city of Jerusalem and the temple have been destroyed.[9] The contention of Morgenstern is that "clearly the sufferings of the people are of the immediate present and are bitter in extreme degree. The hand of the merciless enemy still rests heavily upon them."[1] The assignment of this passage to Deutero-Isaiah has been rejected. In fact, Morgenstern argues that this is no prophecy; it is a national cry of anguish to Yahweh. If this is later than Deutero-Isaiah and is the fresh outcry born of new grief, a devastation of Jerusalem after 539 B.C. is indicated. The mention of the temple argues for a date later than 516 B.C., and the description of the temple as "where our fathers praised thee"[2] requires at least one generation after 516, i.e., 490 B.C. or later. But Morgenstern is being too literalistic in his interpretation. The freshness of the disaster and the 445 B.C. date of Nehemiah's expectation of improved affairs in Jerusalem lead Morgenstern to further limit this poem to 490-465 B.C.[3] This conclusion leads him one more step to suggest that this period of 490-465 B.C. almost equals the dates of the reign of Xerxes over the Persian Empire. Probably it was in his reign that the newly discovered disaster to Judah and Jerusalem occurred.[4]

---

[1] Weiser, Psalms, pp. 518, 544. [2] Ibid., pp. 354, 355, 438, 439.

[3] Ibid., pp. 562, 563. [4] Ibid., pp. 109, 110.

[5] Ibid., p. 794; cf. supra, Chapter II, pp. 96-98.

[6] Hebrew text 63:15-64:11.

[7] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 149; see infra, Chapter III, p. 131.

[8] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 147. [9] 63:18; 64:10, 11.

Joel 3:2bβ-8, 19, 20[5]

These verses in Joel seem to be historical in the midst of a larger eschatological passage, according to Morgenstern, and refer to the judgment of Yahweh upon Tyre, Sidon, and Philistia in verses 2-8; upon Egypt and Edom in verses 19, 20. It is not stated but is implied that Judah, including

---

[1] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 148. [2] 64:11.

[3] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 148-150.

[4] Ibid., p. 150. [5] Hebrew text 4:2bβ-8, 19, 20.

Jerusalem and the temple, has been destroyed. Morgenstern's relation of verses 2-8 to his general theme has much more cogency than his interpretation of verses 19, 20 in this vein. Verses 19 and 20 do no more than predict doom upon Egypt and Edom for violence done to the people of Judah and for shedding innocent blood.[1] Morgenstern does not explain why Egypt, herself in rebellion against Persia, was involved in this catastrophe, in effect fighting against herself.[2] Tyre, Sidon, and Philistia are condemned for taking treasures and people--the people of Judah to be sold as slaves to the Greeks, probably the Ionians. The result was a great dispersion of the Jews, not in groups as in the Babylonian Exile, but individually as slaves over much of the world. This came as a result of the catastrophe which Morgenstern seeks to establish historically.[3]

Nehemiah 5:8 and Isaiah 60:4, 8-22

Confirming evidence for the conclusions relative to the selling of slaves from Judah to other nations is found in Nehemiah 5:8, in which it is recorded that the Jews in Judah in the time of Nehemiah were ransoming their fellow Jews who had been sold to the nations.[4]

Isaiah 60 is an ardently nationalistic poem which Morgenstern assumes was written just prior to the going of the deputation to Nehemiah in 445 B.C.

---

[1] Morgenstern argues (HUCA, XXVII (1956), 151) that the mention of Egypt here probably was motivated by different circumstances from the 485 B.C. event and suggests as a possibility the attack of the Egyptians on the Jewish community of Syene and the destruction of its temple in 411 B.C. (reported in Cowley, Aramaic Papyri of the 5th Century B.C., Nos. 30-34, pp. 108-129).

[2] See infra, Chapter III, p. 131.

[3] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 150-153. [4] Ibid., p. 153.

A very modest third Temple had been erected but no walls or city to go with it. This poem, in vision, sees Yahweh returning the enslaved Jews from the nations of the world to Judah once more and the restoration of the splendor and power of his city and his people.[1]

The Historic Setting of the Catastrophe

On the basis of the interpretations of the Old Testament passages set forth, Morgenstern seeks to reconstruct the historic setting of the 485 B.C. catastrophe. Appeal is made to Ezra 4:7-23, containing the report to Artaxerxes from the Persian officials in Samaria that Jerusalem was being rebuilt. They contend that rebellion will be the outcome if the work is not stopped. Artaxerxes is told that a search of the archives of his fathers will reveal confirmation of the charge that Jerusalem has been a seditious city.[2] Since the walls had not yet been rebuilt, it must follow that this event is dated in the time of Artaxerxes I (465-425 B.C.), but prior to Nehemiah's successful rebuilding of the walls.[3] The appeal to archives, according to Morgenstern, is logically not to the records of the Assyrian or Babylonian kings, but to the kings of the Persian Empire: Cyrus, Cambyses, Darius I, and Xerxes. He further contends that more specific reference must be to Darius I and Xerxes, there being no evidence whatsoever that Jewish rebellion occurred during the reigns of Cyrus or Cambyses. The reference must be to the rebellion of Zerubbabel under Darius I and the 485 B.C. rebellion in the time of Xerxes, both of which were abortive.[1]

---

[1] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 154, 155.

[2] Ibid., p. 156.

[3] Ibid., pp. 156, 157.

The Zerubbabel rebellion was not of great historical import, according to Morgenstern.[2] It was crushed, but there was no ensuing destruction of walls (but there is no evidence presented that walls then existed) or city. Morgenstern explains this by reference to two parties in Jerusalem in the post-Exilic period, the Nationalists and the Universalists. This rebellion was fostered by the Nationalists, with their hope for Jewish supremacy, especially in their area of the world. The theory of the Universalists, with their ideas of religious liberalism coupled with a distinctly universalistic outlook, was to the liking of the Persians and actually aided their purposes. Thus after the crushing of the Nationalists in this rebellion, the Persians gave their aid and support to the Universalists, and the rebuilding of the city went on apace.[3]

Morgenstern next appeals to a single verse, seemingly standing alone, Ezra 4:6. The meaning and significance of the verse is admittedly vague.[4] In this verse is found the beginning point of the coalition which destroyed Jerusalem in 485 B.C. The verse states: "And in the reign of Ahasuerus

---

[1] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 158. The problem of the order of Ezra and Nehemiah events is a large one, and no attempt to solve it can be made here. On this problem see especially: Rowley, "Nehemiah's Mission and Its Background," BJRL, XXXVII (1955), 528-561; Rowley, The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament (London: Lutterworth Press, 1952), pp. 129-160; Norman H. Snaith, "The Historical Books," in The Old Testament and Modern Study, pp. 107-114; John Bright, History of Israel, pp. 375-386 (an excursus on the date of Ezra's mission to Jerusalem); Morgenstern, "The Dates of Ezra and Nehemiah," JSS, V (1962), 1-11; Emmett Willard Hamrick, "A New Study of the Ezra Problem," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1951 [he dates Ezra 398 B.C., Nehemiah 445 B.C.]), pp. 295-307.

[2] Morgenstern assumes that the Zerubbabel rebellion is historical fact. It is, quite the contrary, hypothetical.

[3] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 158-162.

[4] Batten, ICC Ezra-Nehemiah, p. 3.

[Xerxes], in the beginning of his reign, they wrote an accusation against the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem."[1] The reference is to the beginning of the reign of Xerxes,[2] thus 486/5 B.C.[3] The ones making the charge were, in all probability, the people of the land referred to previously in Ezra 4:7-23.[4] What was the accusation?

> . . . there [cannot] be the slightest doubt just what the contents of this report may have been. That it was a hostile charge, definitely unfavorable to the Jewish people, the word sitnah, "hostile accusation," implies unmistakably. And made in the accession year of the new king, even before he had been formally installed in office and his first, official regnal year had begun, presumably therefore before he could have gotten administrative affairs firmly in hand, it could have had only one import. Linked with the direct suggestion expressed in Ezra 4.15, 20, the significance of which we have already determined, it can mean only that it must have been at just this seemingly opportune moment at the death of Darius I and the accession of Xerxes to the Persian throne, i.e., in the final two months of 486 and the first three months of 485 B.C., that this second rebellion of the Jewish people, or at least of the Nationalist party within it, directed to the end of throwing off the Persian yoke, regaining political independence, and setting a native Jewish king upon the throne, was attempted. The moment must have seemed to these intense Jewish nationalists auspicious. For it they had undoubtedly been waiting throughout the entire, long reign of Darius I.[5]

It is further suggested that the Persian defeat in 490 B.C. at Marathon gave great impetus to the planning of this rebellion. Morgenstern supposes that the actual planning of the rebellion went on from 490 B.C.

---

[1] This verse is omitted in I Esdras.

[2] See Bowman, IB Ezra, p. 598.

[3] Perhaps verses 4-6 are a unity, this fragment being the only passage surviving from the period of Xerxes, 485-464 B.C. Batten, ICC Ezra-Nehemiah, pp. 155, 156. Verse 6 clearly indicates that in the beginning of the reign of Xerxes there was trouble with Judah. What the trouble was is not explained. Any explanation proposed must be hypothetical.

[4] Morgenstern understands these to be, more specifically, the Persian officials in Samaria. HUCA, XXVII (1956), 166.

[5] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 167.

Darius I was an old man and could die at almost any time. The Jewish nationalists saw his coming death as the moment for their decisive action. They were ready and waiting.[1] The assumption of Morgenstern is that Darius I was critically ill with no hope of recovery for a time prior to his death in November of 486 B.C. The Jews, on their New Year, just prior to his death, inaugurated their rebellion by crowning a native Jewish king, making thereby official proclamation of Judah's political independence.[2]

When Xerxes was advised of this rebellion[3] he had his hands full--a rival to the throne and a rebellion in Egypt.[4] Thus he dealt with this Judaean insurrection by permitting the coalition of neighbors, with Persian support, to attack Judah.[5] The city of Jerusalem was destroyed, the majority of the people were sold into slavery, and the newly appointed king was captured and slain. This was the tragic catastrophe of 485 B.C., meticulously reconstructed by Morgenstern (but only hypothetical).[6]

The Judaean King

Morgenstern next deals with the evidence concerning and the identification of the Judaean king set upon the throne of David on Rosh Hashanah, 486 B.C. While this is an interesting study, the arguments are not essential to the purposes of this dissertation in the sense that the historical arguments concerning the events of 486/5 B.C. are: thus only a brief analysis is presented here.

---

[1] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 168, 169. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 170, 171.

[3] Ezra 4:6. [4] See *supra*, Chapter III, pp. 126, 127.

[5] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVII (1956), 171, 172.

[6] Morgenstern notes (HUCA, XXVII (1956), 126) his debt in the hypothesis to Winckler, Sellin, and G. F. Moore. See also North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah* (London: Oxford University Press, 1948), pp. 49-55.

The new king is identified as "Menahem," this being either his name or the title-name assumed upon his coronation. The identification is based upon references in Lamentations, chapter 1,[1] where Jerusalem is represented as mourning her lack of a "Menahem," usually translated "comforter" or "reassurer."[2] Against the background of the tragic events uncovered by Morgenstern, he interprets these references as being to this king. Confirmatory support is found in Isaiah 51:12 f., where Yahweh[3] says to Jerusalem: "I, the Eternal One, am thy Menahem."[4] Morgenstern grants that the evidence is not great and that the conclusions are not conclusive, yet he insists that they are probable.[5]

The remainder of his arguments center around Malachi 2:10-16. Basic in his analysis is his conjectural emendation of verse 11, inserting צר , for which he can cite only metrical and contextual evidence.[6] By metrical standards צר is no more demanded than any other word of equal metrical value. The case that he attempts to make from context seems to be based on the pre-supposition that a reference to Tyre occurs in the text. Of significance also is his interpretation of "the daughter of a foreign god" as a princess, the daughter of a foreign king who was identified with a god. Morgenstern assumes that this could only mean the king of Tyre and his daughter.[1] It is granted that relatively little is known about religious practices among ancient Near Eastern countries, yet it seems the general rule that there was commonly held to exist a relationship between royalty and divinity. Tyre may be, but is not necessarily, indicated here.

---

[1] Verses 2, 9, 16, 17, 21.

[2] "Menahem" is the name of the Messiah in the Talmud. Sanhedrin, 98b (Soncino Talmud, p. 667).

[3] See Morgenstern, "Deutero-Isaiah's Terminology for 'Universal God,'" JBL, LXII (1943), 269-280.

[4] But see North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, pp. 2, 3-5, 49-55, 137.

[5] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVIII (1957), 15-18. [6] Ibid., p. 24.

The passage from Malachi is interpreted as the prophet's reflection on the proposed marriage of "Menahem"[2] and the princess of Tyre, involving the divorce of the lawful Jewish wife of "Menahem" in order to cement a treaty of alliance between the two nations.[3] The outcome of the negotiations was unfavorable, and the alliance and marriage probably never took place.[4]

Of particular interest for the purposes of this dissertation is the conjecture (which is admittedly nothing more[5]) by Morgenstern:

> We have seen that in the conquest and destruction of the little Jewish community in Palestine the Edomites were particularly ruthless and that they were animated by a strong desire for revenge, obviously for some wrong which Judah must have wrought upon them. Moreover, it is reasonable to assume that this wrong must have been committed quite recently for a desire for revenge to express itself so actively and savagely. What this wrong may have been we can only guess, for there are absolutely no records or indications thereof; but the guess is not at all difficult. The economic self-sufficiency and prosperity of Judah depended primarily upon its control of Akaba . . . and the diversion there of the traffic which came from Southern Arabia . . . to Akaba, and . . . along the . . . so-called "King's Highway," to Damascus.[6]

---

[1] In support of his view that the king of Tyre was a King-God in an unusual way for the Palestinian area of the world, see: Morgenstern, "The King-God Among the Western Semites and the Meaning of Epiphanes," VT, X (1960), 138-197.

[2] The text of Malachi 2:10-16 is couched in the plural; Morgenstern makes it singular.

[3] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVIII (1957), 31-35.

[4] Ibid., pp. 41, 42.

[5] Ibid., p. 35.

[6] Ibid., pp. 35, 36.

In brief, Morgenstern proposes that part, at least, of the treaty proposed between Tyre and "Menahem" was that Judah would gain control of Aqabah and the King's Highway and divert trade from Damascus to Tyre.[1]

> It is not at all improbable that even before these negotiations had begun, or else almost immediately thereafter, as the first, indispensable step in the program thus formulated by the two kings, this king of Judah, supported by his ardent nationalistic followers, had actually attempted to wrest Akaba from the Edomites, of course by force of arms, and that in so doing he may have inflicted much more harm upon the Edomite country and its people, sufficient to arouse their deep resentment and desire for revenge.[2]

This successful plan gives Morgenstern good reason also for the ready participation of Moab, Ammon, and the desert tribes in the coalition against Judah in 485 B.C.[3]

Antecedents of the Catastrophe

The antecedent events of the 485 B.C. catastrophe to Jerusalem are, for Morgenstern, found chiefly in party activity among the Jews in Judah and Jerusalem. A distinct and sweeping view of universalism in post-Exilic Judaism was developed by Deutero-Isaiah.[4] The doctrine basically asserts that " . . . Yahweh is the one and only God, that there is no other god,"[5] and that

> . . . Yahweh, Israel's God, is the one and only God, the Eternal One, the sole Creator of the universe, and that too with benevolent purpose, that it may be inhabited by men. But for this world to be inhabited,

---

[1] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXVIII (1957), 36, 37.

[2] Ibid., p. 37.

[3] Ibid.

[4] By Deutero-Isaiah Morgenstern means Isaiah 40-48. For him Trito-Isaiah is "not a single prophet, perhaps a disciple of Deutero-Isaiah, as has not infrequently been suggested, but rather a long succession of prophetic personalities over a protracted period, extending from 520 B.C. to well into the fourth century B.C." "The Message of Deutero-Isaiah in its Sequential Unfolding," HUCA, XXIX (1958), 3.

[5] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXIX (1958), 60.

> and inhabited securely and happily, warfare must come to an end, men must cease to destroy each other, and the world must be unified, organized as one political unit, one single world-empire under one supreme world-king, chosen for this role by Yahweh, the Creator, His true "Anointed One," Cyrus and, impliedly, his posterity after him. Thus, and only thus, through Yahweh and the fulfillment in this manner of his ultimate world-purpose, will mankind find salvation, the true salvation, which until this moment it had sought so eagerly, so desperately and so futilely. And at last, finding this salvation, it will naturally and properly and in fulfillment of one phase of Yahweh's total world-purpose reject completely the false gods, whose complete inability to save has been convincingly demonstrated, and will turn to the one, sole God of the universe, who has wrought this salvation for them, and will swear by and worship Him and Him alone.
>
> But how shall they find Him and how recognize Him, when they do find Him? For this very purpose Yahweh, the one world-God, has chosen Israel . . . as His people and His servant . . . . And the service which it is to perform is to bear witness of Yahweh unto the nations . . . .[1]

Morgenstern posits the existence of two parties in Judah in post-Exilic times down to 485 B.C.. The Universalist party accepted the full import of Deutero-Isaiah's message. Israel, for them, ceased to exist as a separate political force. It was politically a part of the Persian Empire, with recognition of the Persian king as its ruler. From a religious standpoint the Universalists were anxious to rebuild Jerusalem and the temple, worship Yahweh, and fulfill their mission to the nations. The Nationalist party accepted the universalism of Deutero-Isaiah, but refused to go as far with it as he did. They accepted the idea of Cyrus and his successors as rulers of the world-empire as an interim arrangement. Only through a Jewish world-empire could the ultimate and enduring purpose of Yahweh be served.[2]

Morgenstern points out that the Nationalists, with the half-hearted leadership of Zerubbabel, precipitated a revolt in the 523-520 B.C. period of regnal confusion following the suicide of Cambyses. The rebellion amounted to little, and with its failure the Nationalists went underground and the Universalists held power.[1] The revolt in 485 B.C. was a Nationalist party movement, doomed to failure before it began, because these Nationalists thought they need not fight--Yahweh would fight their battles for them; there would be no possibility of defeat.[2] But utter and crushing defeat came, and the parties were both crushed, the Nationalists to revive later; the Universalists, never again.[3] It is more than strange, if Morgenstern's hypothesis is correct, that the revolting party revived, while the uninvolved party failed to survive.

---

[1] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXIX (1958), 60, 61. Some of his thought is strikingly similar to that of H. H. Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election (London: Lutterworth Press, 1950), especially pp. 45-68.

[2] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXXI (1960), 3, 4.

While Xerxes was, understandably, ill disposed toward Judah, he required no warriors from her for his ill-fated invasion of Greece.[4] But large quotas were exacted from her neighbors who had formed this coalition against Judah in 485 B.C. Morgenstern opines that most of these warriors never returned to their native lands, leaving these nations but remnants of their former selves.[5] Thus Edom, Ammon, and Moab[6] were easy prey for the Nabataeans who overran their lands.[7] The analysis of Morgenstern is that Ezra now appears on the Jerusalem scene in 458 B.C., armed with a commission from Artaxerxes I to restore the temple and its cult.[1] This Ezra had accomplished by 450 B.C., or earlier. Ezra then yielded to public urging that he exceed the authority of his commissions and began rebuilding the city walls.[2] This rebuilding was reported,[3] and the work halted until Nehemiah came with royal permission to build these walls--prior to his return to Susa. In 432 B.C. Nehemiah returned to a Jerusalem replete with walls and a temple and with a royal appointment as governor. His task then was to repopulate the city.[4] Morgenstern concludes his study:

---

[1] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXXI (1960), 4, 6.

[2] Ibid., pp. 8-11. Note Morgenstern's interpretation of war legislation in Deuteronomy 20, which he contends originated with this party and in this revolt.

[3] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXXI (1960), 17.

[4] Ibid., p. 17. This probably came about as a result of the depopulated condition of the nation.

[5] See Morgenstern, "The Rest of the Nations," JSS, II (1957), 225-231.

[6] There is no evidence that Ammon and Moab were overrun by the Nabataeans.

[7] Morgenstern assigns to this period the writing of much "Damn-Edom" material:Obadiah, Isaiah 34, 63:1-6; Malachi 1:2-5. HUCA, XXXI (1960), 18.

> For all practical purposes the effects of the catastrophe of 485 B.C. upon the Jewish community of Palestine and upon the city of Jerusalem were now, viewed in a broad sense, remedied. From this point on the history of the Jewish community in Palestine advanced in quite normal manner.[5]

Conclusions

Perhaps a brief view of how Morgenstern arrives at his drastic conclusions is needed at this point. Following an approach which is quite valid as to methodology, he takes a hypothesis with the view of either proving or disproving it on the basis of Biblical and extra-Biblical evidence. His hypothesis is that a major (according to him, the 485 B.C. catastrophe was second only to the 70 A.D. destruction of Jerusalem) disaster befell the city of Jerusalem and probably the temple between the rebuilding of the temple in 516 B.C. and the opening events recorded in Nehemiah (ca. 444 B.C.). The initial criticism of this study by Morgenstern is that, once the hypothesis has been set forth, there seems to be no doubt of its basic truth, i.e., it is accepted as fact. The supporting evidence seems directed, not so much in an attempt to support the truth of the primary hypothesis, as to give refinements and details to this hypothetical historical event and its concomitants. Arguments which might appear contrary to Morgenstern's hypothesis are given little, if any, consideration. He also leaves many questions unanswered. For example, if Ezra and Nehemiah are to be dated after 485 B.C., who rebuilt the walls and temple in Jerusalem prior to 516 B.C.? Morgenstern seems to understand that Zerubbabel did, but he finds no real support for such a view.

---

[1] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXXI (1960), 23. Cf. Ezra 7:1 ff., 9:9. Morgenstern's dating of Ezra is incorrect. He must have someone to have rebuilt the temple prior to the coming of Nehemiah to Jerusalem. His assumption that this one was Ezra is based upon Ezra 7:27. Ezra was commissioned by the king of Persia "to beautify" the temple. His confusion of the history of the period based on the work of Ezra-Nehemiah and the questionable interpretation that "to beautify" equals "to rebuild" argue against his dating. Morgenstern's primary evidence for his dating of Ezra is based upon his 485 B.C. hypothesis. Other evidence cited (references to high priests and calendric evidence) is cumulative in relation to his primary evidence but is not independently conclusive. Morgenstern, "The Dates of Ezra and Nehemiah," JSS, VII (1962), 1-11; "A Chapter in the History of the High-priesthood," AJSL, LX (1938), 1-24, 183-197, 360-377; "The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel," HUCA, I (1924), 22-35; "Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel," HUCA, X (1935), 52-72; "The Chanukkah Festival and the Calendars of Ancient Israel," HUCA, XX (1947), 1-136; XXI (1948), 457-470.

[2] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXXI (1960), 27; Ezra 4:7-23.

[3] See supra, Chapter III, pp. 128-131.

[4] Morgenstern, HUCA, XXXI (1960), 28, 29.

[5] Ibid., p. 29.

The basic elements of Morgenstern's reconstruction of the events of 485 B.C. are:

1. The hypothesis is called forth to explain the grief of Nehemiah in 1:1-3, ca. 444 B.C. This grief is explained in a strange way. Nehemiah's grief is, according to Morgenstern, first for the 485 B.C. destruction of Jerusalem; then he seems to change his position: it is for the failure of his pet project, the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem under the leadership of Ezra.

2. Prior to 444 B.C., yet after 586 B.C., and necessarily after 516 B.C., Jerusalem had become a prosperous and splendid city. This conclusion

rests upon his interpretation of Psalm 48 and particularly upon his dating of the psalm between 516 and 485 B.C. That such a dating is possible is granted, but it is highly unlikely. With the rejection of his contention of proof of this dating, the structure Morgenstern builds has inadequate support.

3. He assumes, on the basis of Lamentations 1:10, that Ammon, Moab, and Edom (with reference to Deuteronomy 23:4) were the principal agents in accomplishing the second destruction of Jerusalem. He will not grant this as a reference to hostile agreement to or, perhaps, participation in the 586 B.C. siege, since on the basis of Jeremiah he assumes that all these nations were allies of Judah at that time, all of which he cannot conclusively support. These conclusions are the primary bases of the theory concerning 485 B.C. Once these are accepted, there remain basically no more than refinements as to exact date, concomitant events, personalities, etc., all of which Morgenstern supplies in delightful abundance.

There remains a fundamental question concerning this hypothesis, and Morgenstern nowhere gives a hint as to its answer: if Jerusalem was destroyed and the temple devastated in 485 B.C., how did such a major catastrophe escape obvious mention in Jewish history--Biblical and/or extra-Biblical? Other catastrophes, both before and after 485 B.C., are fully recorded and amply documented. It is admitted that this is an argument from silence, since there are no historical accounts dealing with this period of Jewish history. While arguments from silence are usually weak ones, the nature of this argument gives it some substance. One would expect some record to have been made or some later reference given concerning such a major catastrophe. The fact that there is no satisfactory answer to this question provides additional evidence for the rejection of Morgenstern's conclusion that Jerusalem in 485 B.C. was destroyed by Edom _et_ _alii_. This, therefore, provides no evidence of or occasion for the expression of "Damn-Edom Theology."

In all fairness, while one must insist upon the rejection of his primary conclusion, Professor Morgenstern deserves much credit for the valuable study discussed here. His methodology is sound--the setting forth of a hypothesis to be tested. One of the strong points of his position is his treatment of Nehemiah 1:1-3, especially verse 3, in which he has pointed out that the 'remnant' is not the 'holy remnant' referred to elsewhere in the Old Testament. This could well be a surviving remnant from an unknown catastrophe to Judah. Another significant point in favor of his conclusion is the isolated and incomplete verse, Ezra 4:6, which he points out as having come from the beginning of the reign of Xerxes, and the only clear Old Testament reference to his reign, indicating that there was trouble in Judah with the Persian authorities. But what this trouble was is unknown. In general Morgenstern is to be commended for his open-mindedness in considering so drastic a rewriting of Old Testament history as he proposed, for his most adequate knowledge of the Old Testament text, and for his familiarity with the broad scope of the history of the ancient Near East.

Chapter IV

CONCLUSIONS

Definitive conclusions concerning the attitudes exhibited toward Edom in the Old Testament are impossible. Conclusions must be expressed as tentative, but some indications of the directions of such conclusions are possible.

This study has pointed out the fragmentary knowledge available on the history of Edom. The most promising source of evidence needed for the reconstruction of the history of Edom is careful excavation of selected sites in the territory of ancient Edom. It was thought some years ago that many of the answers concerning the boundaries and history of Edom had been set forth conclusively as a result of the explorations in Eastern Palestine and the Negeb by Dr. Nelson Glueck. Since that time additional discoveries have come to light that have raised serious questions about the validity of some of Glueck's conclusions. Evidence, cited by G. Lankester Harding, discovered at Amman, Naʿûr, and Mount Nebo give clear indication of a sedentary population in the ancient territory of Ammon in the Late Bronze Age (ca. 1600-1300 B.C.). Glueck claimed that no sedentary population existed in Ammon, Moab, or Edom in this period. As has been suggested earlier, if Glueck was in error in his conclusions regarding the population of Ammon, it is entirely possible that he was also in error in such conclusions regarding Edom. And if this is true, it follows also that he may be in error in conclusions concerning later times as well. A rapid survey, riding over, walking through, and flying above a large area with no more than examination and collection of pottery sherds and other scattered artifacts from the surface of various mounds is not a sufficient basis for such dogmatic and far-reaching conclusions as those set forth by Dr. Glueck. Beno Rothenberg and others have taken issue with Glueck's analysis of the copper mining of the Arabah and its importance in the history of both Judah and Edom in the Old Testament period, and with his interpretation of the resulting evidence from the excavation of Tell el-Kheleifeh. These serious questions about the conclusions reached by Glueck suggest the need for additional, more exhaustive explorations and excavations in the territory of ancient Edom.

Questions have also been raised concerning Glueck's conclusions as to the western boundary of Edomite territory. The position has been stated and defended that Edomite control extended over the area west of the Wadi Arabah. The Biblical evidence clearly supports this position; Glueck's conclusions would discount this evidence. Again, it must be pointed out, only additional exploration and excavation will resolve the unknowns in this area.

The problem, especially important for this study, of what happened to Edom after ca. 590 B.C. remains for the most part unsolved. Neither Biblical nor extra-Biblical sources give clear evidence of the course of Edom's history. It is almost certain that Edom was involved in the 587 B.C. destruction of Judah and Jerusalem--as allies of the Babylonian conquerors--and that the initial intensity of "Damn-Edom" thought emerged from this period. In 582 B.C., according to Josephus, Nebuchadrezzar made war on and subjugated Ammon and Moab; but Edom is not mentioned. Whether she shared a similar fate but was not mentioned by Josephus or escaped conquest at this time is unknown. Certainly by 312 B.C. the Edomites were out of their mountain fortress of Seʿir and were settled in the Negeb of Judah. Recent evidence from Tell el-Maskhuta enables one to suggest more exact dates for the Nabataean invasion of Edom and the resulting move of the Edomites to southern Palestine.[1] This invasion with the resulting Edomite movement into what was at least peripheral Jewish territory probably came in the late 6th to the early 5th centuries B.C. This movement of Edomites into territory near the small post-Exilic Jewish community which was considered potentially their own was a contributing factor to "Damn-Edom Theology."

The history of Edom, with its many unknown factors and hidden years, is one of the serious gaps in modern knowledge of and understanding of the history of the ancient Near East of Biblical times. It is hoped that the near future will see careful and extensive work in this area of Near Eastern studies.

A significant part of the study presented in this dissertation is the examination of the hypothesis of Professor Julian Morgenstern that Jerusalem was attacked and destroyed in 485 B.C. by a coalition of neighboring states including Edom. This hypothesis is interesting, and its formulation shows careful and painstaking scholarship; but its rejection is demanded. Dates and "facts" are established without conclusive evidence, and these form the primary bases of Morgenstern's case for the events of 485 B.C.

The historical references of the Old Testament to Edom are not extensive but are more than insignificant. There is, of course, much more to the relations between Israel-Judah and Edom than the Old Testament records, and, with the little extra-Biblical evidence added, there is still much that is unknown. The attitudes exhibited toward Edom in the Old Testament suggest that there was much more to these relations between Israel-Judah and Edom than is explained on the surface. Perhaps a more complete knowledge of the history of Edom would give some additional clues as to the relations between these conflicting peoples.

---

[1] See Chapter I, pp. 43-45.

The existence of animosity in varying, but usually intense, degrees between Israel-Judah and Edom in the Old Testament is amply evident. About the only kind word spoken for the Edomites is concerning their admission into the "congregation of Yahweh"[1] and may well be a late addition to the Old Testament text. Traditionally there was hatred between Hebrew and Edomite, as reflected in the Old Testament text. The present writer is not willing to accept the Jacob-Esau stories as historical fact; nor is he willing to deny all historical value to them. It is exceedingly difficult to fathom the exact value of such ancient stories. It is safe to say that from time immemorial there had been ill feelings between the people who became the Edomites and those who were the Hebrews. The refusal of the Edomites to give passage to the Hebrews on their way to Canaan was, perhaps, instrumental in the development of this tradition. The conquest of Edom by David and its control and exploitation by Solomon and some of his successors was fuel for the fires of ill feeling already kindled. The see-saw struggle between Edomites and Judaeans in the period of the divided monarchies was the sort of situation that makes bitter enemies who take every opportunity to inflict damage and destruction each upon the other. The Edomites and Judaeans appear briefly as potential allies against a common enemy in the period between 597 and 587 B.C. But this anti-Babylonian alliance never materialized.

The part played by Edom in 587 B.C. is nowhere clearly evident. It seems indicated by available evidence that the Edomites were involved in the siege and destruction of Jerusalem. Whether they volunteered to aid Nebuchadrezzar or were drafted for this service is not known. The possibility must also be acknowledged that the Edomites may have simply stood by and taken no action to aid the Judaeans in their day of disaster. The Old Testament evidence is that, whether draftees or volunteers, these Edomites exceeded what the Judaeans considered the call of normal duty in their vindictiveness and cruelty in the action against Jerusalem. The suggestion is made (although it is not capable of proof at the present time) that the Edomites volunteered for this duty as a result of a combination of circumstances.

---

[1] Deuteronomy 23:8, 9; supra, Chapter III, pp. 113-114.

Nebuchadrezzar knew that the Edomites had been involved in a plot with these Hebrews to revolt against his imperial control. Volunteering for service in this siege of Jerusalem would afford an excellent opportunity to convince Nebuchadrezzar of their loyalty to him and to gain his support, and they did not really care for these Hebrews, anyway. Perhaps the cause of the Edomite alliances, first with Judah _et alii_, then with Nebuchadrezzar was that Edom needed help. Pressure was already being felt at home from Arab tribes and perhaps, even at this time, from the precursors of the Nabataean invasions from the Hejaz.[1] That the Edomites did participate, and that with a fury and a vindictive spirit, in the 587 B.C. destruction of Jerusalem is clearly evident from the Biblical references; and it is to this event and to this participation that most of the "Damn-Edom" passages ultimately are to be related. Further animosity arose, no doubt, as a result of the Edomite settlement of the Negeb, as far north as Hebron, in the territory that the small post-Exilic Jewish community hoped and planned to control. The Edomites, now known as the Idumaeans, were probably in southern Palestine as early as the 5th century B.C., posing a threat to the small Jewish community.

---

[1] John Gray, _Archaeology and the Old Testament World_ (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1962), p. 102.

Historical evidence makes it difficult to explain the intense hatred of the Jews for Edom unless they did actively participate in the destruction of the Temple in 587 B.C. Efforts to find another disaster caused by or participated in by Edom have failed.[1] The best evidence relating Edom to the 587 B.C. disaster is I Esdras 4:45: "Thou shalt also vow to build up the temple, which the Edomites burned when Judaea was made desolate by the Chaldeans."[2] Verse 50 of the same chapter refers to Edomite occupancy of Jewish territory.

In view of existing evidence it is suggested that the prominence of "Damn-Edom Theology" in early post-Exilic Judaism came historically as a result of the two factors: Edomite participation and cruelty in the destruction of Jerusalem and the Idumaean grasping of traditionally Jewish territory in the south. This Idumaean settlement of the south land was probably quite gradual and may have covered a long period of time. Exact dates are impossible to ascertain; the process probably began in the 6th century B.C. and continued for a century and a half or two centuries. It is possible that some Idumaeans were already in southern Palestine upon the return of the Jews from the captivity in Babylonia. If there was open hostility between Jews and Idumaeans prior to the Maccabaean period it is not recorded. Friendly relations, however, were not likely.

---

[1] By Morgenstern (see _supra_, Chapter III) and S. A. Cook, "I Esdras," _The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament_ (in 2 volumes, edited by R. H. Charles, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913), I, 13.

[2] Cook, "I Esdras," _The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha_, I, 13, 14, argues that these statements are incorrectly associated with 587 B.C. and that a later historical occasion is to be sought.

The existence and expression of "Damn-Edom Theology" is more than simply a problem of historical antecedents. The study presented in this dissertation indicates that the thought of post-Exilic Judaism is involved in a proper evaluation and interpretation of passages expressing this anti-Edom bias.

"Damn-Edom Theology" is, as already set forth, both a part of a tendency of the Hebrews to hate and condemn their neighbors and a separate phenomenon. Moab, Ammon, Tyre, Philistia, Egypt, and others are condemned in the Old Testament with some regularity; but none of these approaches the position of Edom in this respect. The literary attestation of the Old Testament is that Edom was the most hated of all Israel's neighbors and, indeed, became a symbol for the enemies of God's people.

It is impossible to set "Damn-Edom Theology" in a pattern of ancient Near Eastern thought. There are insufficient materials upon which to base conclusions that xenophobia was common to other countries of the ancient Near East. Perhaps the nearest parallel to the attitude of Israel toward Edom is found in the Egyptian attitudes toward the Nubians and the Asiatics.[1] These groups were condemned with regularity by the Egyptians. Probably similar attitudes existed at times in the thought and literary expressions of other nations, but such is not capable of proof at the present time. The present writer suggests that such literary expressions, especially in their intensity and frequency were peculiar to Israel-Judah in the ancient Near East, especially in the thought behind them. The hatred of the Egyptians for the Nubians and the Asiatics stemmed from the fact that these two groups presented more or less constant threats to the autonomy of Egypt, to her peaceful and prosperous existence, and to her imperial designs. Israel considered herself a distinctively different nation. More so than nations about her she considered herself called by the one Universal World God as his peculiar people. In the context of the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants, Israel understood herself to be a special people, enjoying a special relationship with Yahweh. Other nations who did not understand these matters, particularly those who interfered with her attempts to fulfil her divinely appointed purpose, were to be condemned.[1] H. H. Rowley[2] convincingly contends that Israel's view of her election was vastly different from the attitudes of ancient Near Eastern kings who considered themselves the chosen ones of the gods.[3] It is granted that at many times the Israelites did not correctly interpret their election as an election to service rather than to privilege, but they were constantly aware that they were the "Chosen People."

---

[1] Pritchard, ANET, pp. 230, 238, 374, 445. E. A. Wallis Budge, A History of Ethiopia, Nubia, and Abyssinia (in 2 volumes, London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1928), I, 23, 24, says of the kings of the 19th Dynasty (1321-1215): "In the bas-reliefs painted and sculptured during the reigns, these kings are represented as slaying the 'chiefs of the abominable Kesh [Nubia],' but this every king, from the time of the 1st Dynasty downwards, was supposed to do, and such representations formed part of the stock-scenes which every court painter and sculptor was expected to use."

A compartmentalization of elements in Old Testament thought will not provide the solutions needed for an understanding of "Damn-Edom Theology." Such an approach has been expressed by Rolland Emerson Wolfe in "The Editing of the Book of the Twelve."[4] In Wolfe's interpretation of the Minor Prophets there were some thirteen editors or redactors who left their particular imprint on this collection. He has determined that the "Anti-Neighbor Editor" was the fifth of the thirteen. This editor's work came in the early part of the 5th century B.C. when the returned exiles attempted to regain Palestine, found harassment at the hands of their neighbors, and resultantly had their jubilant hopes frustrated.[1] Wolfe says:

---

[1] Thus when Israel said "Damn-Edom," their statement was really "may Yahweh damn Edom."

[2] Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election, esp. pp. 16-19.

[3] J. M. Powis Smith, "The Chosen People," AJSL, XLV (1928-1929), 73 ff.

[4] Rolland Emerson Wolfe, "The Editing of the Book of the Twelve," ZAW, XII; N. F. (1935), 90-129.

> Some fiery hearted Jew, who felt impelled to give literary expression to this new movement of thought, set himself to the task of composing oracles, which for the most part may be called massas (משא), against Judah's hated neighbors. While, in the absence of more definite information, it may be assumed that Amos, in the authentic portions of chapters 1 and 2, originated that style of prophecy, it was this Anti-Neighbor Editor who made most use of the massa style of writing and popularized it. While his writings are also found in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, the major deposit is found in parts of chapters 13-24 of Isaiah.[2]

Wolfe further points out that this Editor was particularly bitter against Edom and the inhabitants of the Mediterranean coast.[3]

It must be granted that the anti-Edom bias in Old Testament religion is an aspect of the more general anti-foreign nation feeling of post-Exilic Judaism, but it is obvious that the anti-Edom element of this feeling was, or at least became, more than simply a part of the general attitude. The wide distribution of anti-foreign oracles and especially of anti-Edom oracles indicates that this attitude was held by more than some fiery-hearted Jewish editor or school of editors.

That there was within post-Exilic Judaism both universalistic and particularistic thought, tendencies, and perhaps even parties (as Morgenstern has contended) has long been obvious to interpreters of the Old Testament. The dating of these tendencies, or movements, is very difficult, if not impossible, in the light of present knowledge of post-Exilic Old Testament history. It is probable that in the Exilic and early post-Exilic periods the destruction of Edom was a part of the hope of restoration. The destruction of Edom was considered a necessity: the Edomites occupied part of their land.[1] It is fairly obvious that both universalism and particularism existed concurrently, with first one and then the other surging to the fore. Judging from the literature of the period, the narrow, particularistic or nationalistic school of thought was the predominant one; and it was this type of thought that fathered "Damn-Edom Theology." The complete separation of the two types of thought may be impossible, for, as expressed in the Old Testament, universalism is the reverse of the coin of which nationalism is the obverse. "Hope of judgement upon the pagan world and of vengeance on Israel's enemies is only one side of the attitude of the post-Exilic prophets towards foreign nations. The other is the possibility of their conversion to Yahweh, the God of Israel."[2] The books of Ruth and Jonah, with their kinder attitudes towards foreign nations, were products of the universalist element in Judaism. It is, perhaps, significant that Edom is not condemned, nor even mentioned in these books.

---

[1] Wolfe, "The Editing of the Book of the Twelve," ZAW, XII, N.F. (1935), 95-98.

[2] Ibid., p. 96.

[3] Ibid., p. 97.

That the anti-Edom bias in Old Testament religion was a part of this ambivalent post-Exilic thought cannot be denied. The ready and frequent condemnation of Edom went beyond this, however, and became more than the expression of hatred for Edom. The Edomites had exhibited the ultimate, or near-ultimate, in inimical action against the Jews. They, and their nation, became the exemplification of a nation and a people opposed to the Jews and their nationalistic desires and endeavors as well as what they interpreted to be their divinely appointed mission. Thus "Edom" came to equal the enemy of the Jews. Probably first (although such development cannot be traced with exactness) "Edom" was used as an expression for the neighboring opponents of the Jewish state and later became a symbol for "the Enemy," and so was used for Rome in post-Biblical Jewish literature.

---

[1] See especially Ezekiel 35 and Lamentations.

[2] J. Lindblom, Prophecy in Ancient Israel (Oxford: Basil Blackwood, 1962), p. 417.

"Damn-Edom Theology" began as a natural historical reaction--the hatred of a people for a cruel and ruthless enemy--and became a concept of eschatological significance expressing hope for and confidence in the destruction of the enemies of the Chosen People.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abel, Félix Marie. *Géographie de la Palestine*. 2 vols. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie., 1933.

Achtemeier, E. R. "Obadiah," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by G. A. Buttrick *et al*. 4 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962, III, 557, 558.

Ackroyd, Peter R. "Commentaries on Ezekiel," *Theology*, LXII (1959), 97-100.

Aeschimann, André. *Le Prophète Jérémie*. Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1959.

Albright, William Foxwell. "Abram the Hebrew, A New Archaeological Interpretation," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, CLXII (1961), 36-54.

________. "Archaeology and the Date of the Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, LVIII (1935), 10-18.

________. *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1942.

________. "A Brief History of Judah from the Days of Josiah to Alexander the Great," *Biblical Archaeologist*, IX (1946), 1-16.

________. "Dedan," *Geschichte und Altes Testament*. "Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie," edited by Gerhard Ebeling, vol. XVI. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1953, pp. 1-12.

________. "The Excavation of the Conway High Place at Petra," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, LVII (1935), 18-26.

________. "The Home of Balaam," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, XXXV (1915), 386-390.

________. "The Horites in Palestine," *From the Pyramids to Paul*, edited by Lewis Gaston Leary. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1935, pp. 9-26.

________. "New Light From Egypt on the Chronology and History of Israel and Judah," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, CXXX (1953), 4-11.

Albright, William Foxwell. "The Old Testament and the Archaeology of Palestine," *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, edited by H. H. Rowley. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951, pp. 1-26.

________. "The Oracles of Balaam," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXIII (1944), 207-233.

________. "Ostracon No. 6043 from Ezion-geber," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, LXXXII (1941), 11-15.

________. "Some Canaanite-Phoenician Sources of Hebrew Wisdom," *Vetus Testamentum Supplement*, III, 1955, *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955, pp. 1-15.

________. "Two Little Understood Amarna Letters from the Middle Jordan Valley," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, LXXXIX (1943), 7-17.

________. *The Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography*. ("American Oriental Series," edited by W. Norman Brown, John K. Shyrock, and E. A. Speiser, vol. V.) New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1934.

Anderson, George W. *A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament*. ("Studies in Theology," edited by Nathaniel Micklem.) London: Gerald Duckworth and Company, 1959.

The Apocrypha. Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1957.

Arden-Close, C. F. "The Rainfall of Palestine," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, LXXIII (1941), 122-128.

Astley, H.J.D. *Biblical Anthropology*. London: Oxford University Press, 1929.

Avigad, N. "The Jotham Seal from Elath," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, CLXIII (1961), 18-22.

Baethgen, Friedrich. *Beiträge zur Semitischen Religiongeschichte*. Berlin: H. Reuther's Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1888.

Baly, Denis. *The Geography of the Bible*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Bardtke, Hans. "Jeremia der Fremdvölkerprophet," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XII (1936), 209-239; XIII (1936), 240-261.

Barnes, W. Emery. *Malachi*. ("The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges," edited by A. F. Kirkpatrick.) Cambridge: The University Press, 1917.

Barton, George A. "Obadiah," *Jewish Encyclopedia*, edited by Isidore Singer *et al*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1905, IX, 369, 370.

Batten, Loring W. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah*. ("International Critical Commentary," edited by C. A. Briggs, S. R. Driver, and Alfred Plummer.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.

Baudissin, Wolf W. von. "Edom," *Realencyklopädia für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche*. Edited by Johann Jakob Herzog. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1898, Bd. V, 162-170.

Bauer, Hans and Pontus Leander. *Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testamentes*. Halle: Max Neimeyer, 1922.

Ben Jehudah, Eliezer. "The Edomite Language," *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, I (1920), 113-115.

Bentzen, Aage. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. 2 vols. in 1. Third Edition. Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad, 1957.

Bewer, Julius A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Obadiah and Joel*. ("International Critical Commentary," edited by C. A. Briggs, S. R. Driver, and Alfred Plummer.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911.

Bič, Miloš. "Zur Problematik des Buches Obadjah," *Vetus Testamentum Supplement*, vol. I, Congress Volume, Copenhagen, 1953. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953, pp. 11-25.

Blake, Frank R. *A Resurvey of Hebrew Tenses*. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1951.

Blank, Sheldon H. *Prophetic Faith in Isaiah*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

________. "Studies in Deutero-Isaiah," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XV (1940), 1-46.

________. "Studies in Post-Exilic Universalism," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XI (1936), 159-191.

Bourke, J. "Le Jour de Yahvé dans Joël," *Revue Biblique*, LXVI (1959), 5-31, 191-212.

Boutflower, Charles. *The Book of Isaiah, Chapters I-XXXIX*. London: Society for Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1930.

Bowman, Raymond A. "The Book of Ezra, Introduction and Exegesis," *Interpreter's Bible*. 12 vols. Edited by George Buttrick *et al*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954, III, 551-661.

Breasted, James Henry. *A History of Egypt from the Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest*. 2nd edition. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.

Briggs, Charles Augustus, and Emilie Grace Briggs. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*. 2 vols. ("International Critical Commentary," edited by C. A. Briggs, S. R. Driver, and Alfred Plummer.) Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1906, 1907.

Bright, John. *Early Israel in Recent History Writing*. ("Studies in Biblical Theology," no. 19.) London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1956.

Bright, John. *A History of Israel*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959.

_______. *The Kingdom of God*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1953.

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1952.

Brown, W. Norman. *Swastika*. New York: Emerson Books, Inc., 1933.

Budge, E. A. Wallis. *A History of Ethiopia, Nubia, and Abyssinia*. 2 vols. London: Methuen and Company, 1928.

Buhl, Frants Peter William. *Geographie des Alten Palästina*. Freiburg und Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr, 1896.

_______. *Geschichte der Edomiter*. Leipzig: Alexander Edelmann, 1893.

Burckhardt, John Lewis. *Travels in Syria and the Holy Land*. London: John Murray, 1882.

Burney, C. F. *Israel's Settlement in Canaan: The Biblical Tradition and its Historical Background*. (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy for 1917.) London: The British Academy, 1921.

Buttenwieser, Moses. *The Psalms Chronologically Treated with a New Translation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.

Caminos, Ricardo A. *Late Egyptian Miscellanies*. ("Brown Egyptological Studies," no. 1.) London: Oxford University Press, 1954.

Cazelles, Henri. "La Mission D'Esdras," *Vetus Testamentum*, IV (1954), 113-140.

Černý, Ladislav. *The Day of Yahweh and Some Relevant Problems*. ("Práce Z Vědeckých Ústavů," LIII.) Praze: Nákladem Filosofické Fakulty University Karlovy, 1948.

Charles, R. H. (ed.). *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913.

Chary, Theophane. *Les Prophètes et le Culte à Partir de L'Exil*. ("Bibliothèque de Théologie," Serie III, Théologie Biblique, vol. III.) Paris: Tournai Desclée et Cie., 1955.

Cheyne, Thomas Kelly. "Dr. Torrey on the Edomites," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XVII (1898), 207, 208.

_______. *The Origin and Religious Content of the Psalter*. (The Bampton Lectures for 1889.) New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1892.

Cook, Stanley A. "Edom," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 14th edition. London: Encyclopaedia Britannica Company, 1929, VIII, 949.

Cook, Stanley A. "I Esdras," *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913, I, 1-58.

_______. "Israel and the Neighboring States," *Cambridge Ancient History*. Edited by J. B. Bury, S. A. Cook, and F. E. Adcock. Cambridge: The University Press, 1929, III, 354-387.

_______. "Israel Before the Prophets," *Cambridge Ancient History*. Edited by J. B. Bury, S. A. Cook, and F. E. Adcock. Cambridge: The University Press, 1929, III, 416-457.

_______. "The Prophets of Israel," *Cambridge Ancient History*. Edited by J. B. Bury, S. A. Cook, and F. E. Adcock. Cambridge: The University Press, 1929, III, 458-500.

_______. *The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology*. (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy for 1925.) London: The British Academy, 1930.

_______. "The Rise of Israel," *Cambridge Ancient History*. Edited by J. B. Bury, S. A. Cook, and F. E. Adcock. Cambridge: The University Press, 1929, II, 352-406.

Cooke, G. A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*. ("International Critical Commentary," edited by C. A. Briggs, S. R. Driver, and Alfred Plummer.) Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1936.

Cowley, Arthur Ernest (ed.). *Aramaic Papyri of the 5th Century B.C.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1923.

Cripps, Richard S. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Amos*. 2nd edition. London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1955.

Crockett, William Day. *A Harmony of the Books of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1951.

Cross, Frank Moore, Jr. *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*. (The Haskell Lectures for 1956-57.) Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1958.

Cunliffe-Jones, Hubert. *Deuteronomy*. ("Torch Bible Commentaries," edited by J. Marsh and A. Richardson.) London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1951.

_______. *The Book of Jeremiah*. ("Torch Bible Commentaries," edited by J. Marsh and A. Richardson.) London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1960.

Daniel, Robert Thomas. "An Interpretation of Malachi in the Light of Its Historical and Critical Problems." Unpublished M.A. thesis, Texas Christian University, 1941.

Daniel-Rops, Henri. *Israel and the Ancient World*. Translated by K. Madge. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1949.

Davidson, A. B. *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*. Revised by A. W. Streane. ("The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges," edited by A. F. Kirkpatrick.) Cambridge: The University Press, 1924.

Dentan, Robert C. "The Book of Malachi, Introduction and Exegesis," *Interpreter's Bible*. 12 vols. Edited by George Buttrick *et al*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956, VI, 1115-1144.

Diodorus Siculus. *Diodorus of Sicily, with an English Translation by C. H. Oldfather*. 12 vols. ("Loeb Classical Library.") London: W. Heinemann, 1933-1957.

Driver, Godfrey Rolles. "Ezekiel, Linguistic and Textual Problems," *Biblica*, XXXV (1954), 145-159, 299-312.

________. "Problems and Solutions," *Vetus Testamentum*, IV (1954), 225-245.

________. *Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System*. (Old Testament Studies, No. 2.) Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1936.

Driver, Samuel Rolles. *The Book of Genesis*. ("Westminster Commentaries," edited by Walter Lock.) 5th ed. London: Methuen and Company, 1906.

________. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy*. ("International Critical Commentary," edited by C. A. Briggs, S. R. Driver, and Alfred Plummer.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903.

________. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. 10th ed. ("International Theological Library," edited by C. A. Briggs and Stewart D. F. Salmond.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902.

________. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1890.

Duhm, Bernhard. *Die Psalmen*. ("Kurzer Hand-Kommentar zum Alten Testament," edited by Karl Marti.) Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1922.

Dupont-Sommer, André. *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. Translated by G. Vermes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961.

Edghill, Ernest Arthur. *The Book of Amos*. Edited by G. A. Cooke. ("Westminster Commentaries," edited by Walter Lock.) London: Methuen and Company, 1914.

Eiselen, Frederick Carl. *The Minor Prophets*. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1907.

________. *Prophecy and the Prophets*. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1909.

Eissfeldt, Otto. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. ("Neue Theologische Grundrisse," edited by R. Bultmann.) Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1956.

Elliger, Karl. *Das Buch der Zwölf Kleinen Propheten, II, Die Propheten Nahum, Habakuk, Zephanja, Haggai, Sacharja, Maleachi*. ("Das Alte Testament Deutsch," edited by V. Herntrich and A. Weiser.) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1951.

Ellison, H. L. *Ezekiel: The Man and His Message*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956.

Epstein, I. (ed.). *The Babylonian Talmud*. 35 vols. London: The Soncino Press, 1935-1952.

Erskine, Mrs. Steuart. *The Vanished Cities of Arabia*. London: Hutchinson and Company, n.d.

Eusebii Pamphili, *Chronicon*. "Patrologiae Cursus Completus," edited by J. P. Migne. 161 vols. in 166. Paris: Migne, 1857-1866. Series Graeca, XIX, cols. 99-598.

Finegan, Jack. *Light from the Ancient Past*. 2nd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959.

Fischer, Johann. *Das Buch Isaias*. 2 vols. ("Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments," edited by F. Feldmann and H. Herkenne.) Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1937.

Fohrer, Georg. "Zehn Jahre Literatur zur Alttestamentlichen Prophetie (1951-1960)." *Theologische Rundschau*, N.F. XXVIII (1962), 235-297.

Fosbroke, Hughell E. W. "The Book of Amos, Introduction and Exegesis," *Interpreter's Bible*. 12 vols. Edited by George Buttrick *et al*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956, VI, 761-853.

Francisco, Clyde T. *Introducing the Old Testament*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1950.

Freedman, H. *Jeremiah*. ("Soncino Books of the Bible," edited by A. Cohen.) London: The Soncino Press, 1949.

Freeman, Allen J. "The Obadiah Problem." Unpublished Th.D. thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1949.

Gardiner, Alan. *Egypt of the Pharaohs*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961.

Gautier, Lucien. *Introduction à L'Ancien Testament*. 2 vols. Lausanne: Librarie Payot, 1939.

Gemser, B. "The *RÎB*-or Controversy Pattern in Hebrew Mentality," *Vetus Testamentum Supplement*, vol. III, 1955, *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955, pp. 120-137.

Glueck, Nelson. *Explorations in Eastern Palestine*. *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, XIV (1933-34), XV (1934-35), XVIII-XIX (1937-39), XXV-XXVIII in 2 parts (1945-49).

Glueck, Nelson. "An Aerial Reconnaissance in Southern Transjordan," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, LXVI (1937), 27-28; LXVII (1937), 19-26.

________. "The Boundaries of Edom," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XI (1936), 141-157.

________. "The Civilization of the Edomites," *Biblical Archaeologist*, X (1947), 77-84.

________. "The Early History of a Nabataean Temple (Khirbet et-Tannûr)," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, LXIX (1938), 7-18.

________. "Explorations in Eastern Palestine and the Negeb," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, LV (1934), 3-21.

________. "Explorations in Eastern Palestine, III," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, LXIV (1936), 9, 10; LXV (1937), 8-28.

________. "Explorations in the Land of Ammon," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, LXVIII (1937), 13-21.

________. "Explorations in Western Palestine," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, CXXXI (1953), 6-15.

________. "Ezion-geber: Solomon's Naval Base on the Red Sea," *Biblical Archaeologist*, I (1938), 14-16.

________. "The First Campaign at Tell el-Kheleifeh (Ezion-geber)," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, LXXI (1938), 3-18 (with a note by W. F. Albright).

________. "The Fourth Season of Exploration in the Negeb," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, CXLII (1956), 17-35.

________. "Further Explorations in Eastern Palestine," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, LI (1933), 9-19.

________. "Further Explorations in Eastern Palestine," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, LXXXVI (1942), 14-27.

________. "Further Explorations in the Negeb," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, CXXXVII (1955), 10-22.

________. "Kenites and Kenizzites," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, LXXII (1940), 22-24.

________. "The Nabataean Temple of Khirbet et-Tannûr," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, LXVII (1937), 6-16.

________. "Ostraca from Elath," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, LXXX (1940), 3-10; LXXXII (1941), 3-11.

Glueck, Nelson. The Other Side of the Jordan. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1940.

_______. "The Recently Discovered Ore Deposits in Eastern Palestine," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, LXIII (1936), 4-7.

_______. The River Jordan. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946.

_______. Rivers in the Desert. New York: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 5719-1959.

_______. "The Second Campaign at Tell el-Kheleifeh (Ezion-geber: Elath)," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, LXXV (1939), 8-22.

_______. "Surface Finds in Edom and Moab," Palestine Exploration Quarterly, LXXI (1939), 188-192.

_______. "The Third Season of Excavation at Tell el-Kheleifeh," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, LXXIX (1940), 2-18.

_______. "The Third Season of Explorations in the Negeb," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CXXXVIII (1955), 7-29.

_______. "The Topography and History of Ezion-geber and Elath," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, LXXII (1938), 2-13.

_______. "Transjordan," Biblical Archaeologist, IX (1946), 45-61.

Gold, Victor Roland. "Studies in the History and Culture of Edom." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1951.

Goldman, Solomon. Samuel. ("Soncino Books of the Bible," edited by A. Cohen.) London: The Soncino Press, 1951.

Gordon, Cyrus H. Introduction to Old Testament Times. Ventnor, N.J.: Ventnor Publishers, 1953.

_______. The World of the Old Testament. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1958.

_______. The Living Past. New York: The John Day Company, 1941.

Gottwald, Norman K. Studies in the Book of Lamentations. ("Studies in Biblical Theology," no. 14.) Chicago: Alec R. Allenson, 1954.

Gray, George Buchanan. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah, I-XXXIX. ("International Critical Commentary," edited by C. A. Briggs, S. R. Driver, and Alfred Plummer.) Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1912.

_______. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Numbers. ("International Critical Commentary," edited by C. A. Briggs, S. R. Driver, and Alfred Plummer.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.

Gray, George Buchanan. "The Foundation and Extension of the Persian Empire," *Cambridge Ancient History*. Edited by J. B. Bury, S. A. Cook, and F. E. Adcock. Cambridge: The University Press, 1930, IV, 1-25.

———. *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1896.

Gray, John. *Archaeology and the Old Testament World*. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962.

———. "The Desert Sojourn of the Hebrews and the Sinai-Horeb Tradition," *Vetus Testamentum*, IV (1954), 148-154.

———. "The Diaspora of Israel and Judah in Obadiah v. 20," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LXV (1953), 53-59.

Grollenberg, L. H. *Atlas of the Bible*. Translated and edited by Joyce M. H. Reid and H. H. Rowley. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1956.

Gunkel, Hermann. *Ausgewählte Psalmen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1917.

———. *Einleitung in die Psalmen*. ("Handkommentar zum Alten Testament.") Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1933.

Hall, H. R. "Israel and The Surrounding Nations," *The People and The Book*, edited by A. S. Peake. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1925, pp. 1-40.

Hammond, Philip C. "Excavations at Petra in 1959," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, CLIX (1960), 26-31.

Hamrick, Emmett Willard. "A New Study of the Ezra Problem." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1951.

Harding, G. Lankester. *The Antiquities of Jordan*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1959.

——— and William L. Reed. "Archaeological News from Jordan," *Biblical Archaeologist*, XVI (1953), 2-17.

Harper, William Rainey. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Amos and Hosea*. ("International Critical Commentary," edited by C. A. Briggs, S. R. Driver, and Alfred Plummer.) Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1905.

Harrelson, Walter. *Jeremiah, Prophet to the Nations*. Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1959.

Hay, Lawrence Cord. "The Oracles Against the Foreign Nations in Jeremiah 46-51." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1960.

Hebert, Gabriel. *The Old Testament from Within*. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Hebert, Gabriel. *When Israel Came Out of Egypt*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1961.

Henshaw, T. *The Latter Prophets*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1958.

Herntrich, Volkmar. *Ezekielprobleme*. ("Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft," LXI.) Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1933.

Herodotus. *Herodotus, with an English Translation by A. D. Godley*. 4 vols. ("Loeb Classical Library.") London: W. Heinemann, 1921-1924.

Heschel, Abraham J. *The Prophets*. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Hölscher, Gustav. *Hesekiel, der Dichter und das Buch*. ("Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft," XXXIX.) Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1924.

Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1952.

Hommel, Fritz. *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition*. Translated by Edmund McClure and Leonard Crosslé. London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1897.

Hornstein, Charles Alexander. "A Visit to Kerak and Petra," *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*, 1898, 94-103.

Horsfield, George and Agnes. "Sela-Petra, the Rock, of Edom and Nabatene," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, IX (1939-41), 105-204 and plates vi-xlix.

Horsfield, George and Agnes Conway. "Historical and Topographical Notes on Edom: With an Account of the First Excavations at Petra," *The Geographical Journal*, LXXVI (1930), 369-390.

Howie, Carl G. *The Book of Ezekiel, The Book of Daniel*, ("Layman's Bible Commentary," edited by B. H. Kelly.) Richmond: John Knox Press, 1961.

________. *The Date and Composition of Ezekiel*. *Journal of Biblical Literature* Monograph Series, vol. IV. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1950.

Huntington, Ellsworth. *Palestine and Its Transformation*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1911.

Hyatt, James Philip. "The Book of Jeremiah, Introduction and Exegesis," *Interpreter's Bible*. 12 vols. Edited by George Buttrick *et al*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956, V, 777-1142.

________. "New Light on Nebuchadrezzar and Judaean History," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXV (1956), 277-284.

________. *Jeremiah, Prophet of Courage and Hope*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1958.

Irvine, James Sheppard. "The Early History of Edom. A Study of the Land of Edom and Its Inhabitants from Prehistoric Times to 922 B.C." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1958.

Irwin, William A. *The Problem of Ezekiel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943.

Jarvis, C. S. "The Forty Years' Wanderings of the Israelites," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, XXXVI (1938), 25-40.

Johnson, Aubrey R. "The Psalms," *The Old Testament and Modern Study*. Edited by H. H. Rowley. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951, pp. 162-209.

________. "The Role of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus," *The Labyrinth*. Edited by S. H. Hooke. London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1935, pp. 71-112.

Josephus, Flavius. *Flavii Iosepi Opera Edidit et Apparatu Critico Instruxit Benedictus Niese*. 7 vols. Berlin: Weidmanns, 1887-1895.

________. *Josephus with an English Translation by H. St. John Thackeray and Ralph Marcus*. 7 vols. ("Loeb Classical Library.") London: W. Heinemann, 1926-1953.

Kahle, Paul. *Opera Minora*. Leiden: E . J. Brill, 1956.

Kapelrud, Arvid S. *Joel Studies*. ("Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift," 1948:4.) Uppsala: A. B. Landequistska Bokhandeln, 1948.

Kaufmann, Yehezkel. *The Biblical Account of the Conquest of Palestine*. Translated by M. Dagut. Jerusalem: Manges Press, 1953.

________. *The Religion of Israel*. Translated and abridged by Moshe Greenberg. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Kautzsch, E. (ed.). *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. 2nd English edition. Translated by A. E. Cowley. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1910.

Kelso, James L. "The Third Campaign at Bethel," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, CLI (1958), 3-8.

Kennett, Robert H. *The Composition of the Book of Isaiah in the Light of History and Archaeology*. (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy for 1909.) London: The British Academy, 1910.

Kirk, George Eden. "Archaeological Explorations in the Southern Desert," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, XXXVI (1938), 211-235.

Kirk, M. E. "An Outline of the Ancient Cultural History of Transjordan," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, LXXVI (1944), 180-198.

Kirkbride, Diana V. W. "The Excavation of a Neolithic Village at Seyl Aqlat, Beidha, Near Petra," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, XCII (1960), 136-145.

Kirkbride, Diana V. W. "Short Notes on Some Hitherto Unrecorded Prehistoric Sites in Transjordan," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, XCI (1959), 52-54.

Kirkpatrick, A. F. *The Book of Psalms*. ("Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges," edited by A. F. Kirkpatrick.) Cambridge: The University Press, 1902.

Kissane, Edward J. *The Book of Isaiah*. Vol. I (I-XXXIX). Revised edition. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1960.

_______. *The Book of Psalms*. Vol. I. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1953.

Kittle, Rudolph (ed.). *Biblica Hebraica*. 8th ed. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1952.

Knight, G. A. Frank. *Nile and Jordan*. London: James Clarke and Company, 1921.

Köhler, Ludwig. *Hebrew Man*. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.

Krämer, Karl Fr. *Numeri und Deuteronomium*. ("Die Heilige Schrift für das Leben Erklärt.") Freiburg: Herder, 1955.

Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Klagelieder*. ("Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament," edited by Martin Noth, Band XX.) Neukirchen: Kreis Moers, 1956.

_______. *Psalmen*. ("Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament," edited by Martin Noth, Band XV.1, 2.) Neukirchen: Kreis Moers, 1960.

Kuhl, Curt. *The Old Testament, Its Origins and Composition*. Translated by C.T.M. Herriot. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1961.

_______. *The Prophets of Israel*. Translated by Rudolph J. Ehrlich and J. P. Smith. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1960.

Kuist, Howard Tillman. *The Book of Jeremiah, The Lamentations of Jeremiah*. ("Layman's Bible Commentary," edited by B. H. Kelly.) Richmond: John Knox Press, 1960.

Lanchester, H.C.O. *Obadiah and Jonah*. ("Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges," edited by A. F. Kirkpatrick.) Cambridge: The University Press, 1918.

Landes, George M. *A Student's Vocabulary of Biblical Hebrew Listed According to Frequency and Cognate*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961.

Langhe, Robert de. *Les Textes de Ras Shamra-Ugarit et Leurs Rapports avec le Milieu Biblique de l'Ancien Testament*. Part III. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1945.

Lawing, W. "Edom, Edomites," *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*. 5 vols. Edited by James Orr. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957, II, 899, 900.

Leslie, Elmer A. *Jeremiah, Chronologically Arranged, Translated and Interpreted*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954.

Libbey, William, and Franklin E. Hoskins. *The Jordan Valley and Petra*. 2 vols. New York: G . P. Putnam's Sons, 1905.

Lindblom, Johannes. *Prophecy in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962.

Lods, Adolphe. *Histoire de la Littérature Hébraïque et Juive des Origines à la Ruine de l'Etat Juif (135 Après J.-C.)*. Paris: Payot, 1950.

________. *The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism*. Translated by S. H. Hooke. ("The History of Civilization," edited by C. K. Ogden.) London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1937.

Lofthouse, W. F. *Israel After the Exile*. ("The Clarendon Bible," edited by Bishop Strong, Bishop Wild, and Canon G. H. Box, vol. IV.) Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1928.

________. *The Prophet of Reconstruction*. London: James Clarke and Company, 1920.

Löhr, Max. *Untersuchungen zum Buch Amos*. "Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft," IV. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1901.

Lucas, A. *The Route of the Exodus of the Israelites from Egypt*. London: Edward Arnold and Company, 1938.

Luckenbill, Daniel David. *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*. 2 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, vol. I, 1926; vol. II, 1927.

Margoliouth, D. S. *The Relations Between Arabs and Israelites Prior to the Rise of Islam*. London: Oxford University Press, 1924.

May, Herbert Gordon. "The Book of Ezekiel, Introduction and Exegesis," *Interpreter's Bible*. 12 vols. Edited by George Buttrick *et al*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956, VI, 41-338.

________. "The Chronology of Jeremiah's Oracles," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, IV (1945), 217-227.

________. "Towards an Objective Approach to the Book of Jeremiah: The Biographer," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXI (1942), 139-156.

Mazar, B. "The Campaign of Pharaoh Shishak to Palestine," *Vetus Testamentum Supplement*, IV, 1957. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957, 57-66.

McCullough, W. Stewart, and William R. Taylor. "The Book of Psalms, Introduction and Exegesis," *Interpreter's Bible*. 12 vols. Edited by George Buttrick *et al*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1955, IV, 3-765.

Meek, Theophile James. "The Book of Lamentations, Introduction and Exegesis," *Interpreter's Bible*. 12 vols. Edited by George Buttrick *et al*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956, VI, 3-40.

________. *Hebrew Origins*. 2nd edition. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Mendelsohn, I. "Slavery in the Ancient Near East," *Biblical Archaeologist*, IX (1946), 74-88.

Meyer, Eduard. *Die Israeliten und Ihre Nachbarstämme*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1906.

________. *Geschichte des Altertums*. 4 Bde. Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1954, Bd. I, Hft. 2.

Milik, J. T. "Nouvelles Inscriptions Nabatéennes," *Syria*, XXXV (1958), 227-251.

Miller, Madeline S., and J. Lane Miller (eds.). *Harper's Bible Dictionary*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956.

Montefiore, C. G., and H. Loewe. *A Rabbinic Anthology*. New York: Meridian Books, [1938].

Moore, George Foote. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-1930.

Morgenstern, Julian. "The Chanukkah Festival and the Calendar of Ancient Israel," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XX (1947), 1-136; XXI (1948), 365-496.

________. "A Chapter in the History of the High-priesthood," *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, LV (1938), 1-24, 183-197, 360-377.

________. "The Dates of Ezra and Nehemiah," *Journal of Semitic Studies*, VII (1962), 1-11.

________. "Deutero-Isaiah's Terminology for 'Universal God,'" *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXII (1943), 269-280.

________. *The Fire Upon the Altar*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1963.

________. "Isaiah 63.7-14," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXIII (1950-51), 185-203.

________. "Jerusalem--485 B.C.," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXVII (1956), 101-179; XXVIII (1957), 15-47; XXXI (1960), 1-29.

________. "The King-God Among the Western Semites and the Meaning of Epiphanes," *Vetus Testamentum*, X (1960), 138-197.

________. "Moses with the Shining Face," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, II (1925), 1-27.

Morgenstern, Julian. " נשקו בר ," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, N.S. XXXII (1942), 371-385.

________. "Psalm 23," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXV (1946), 13-35.

________. "Psalm 48," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XVI (1941), 1-95.

________. "The Rest of the Nations," *Journal of Semitic Studies*, II (1957), 225-231.

________. "The Suffering Servant--A New Solution," *Vetus Testamentum*, XI (1961), 292-320.

________. "Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, X (1935), 1-148.

________. "The Tent of Meeting," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, XXXVIII (1918), 125-139.

________. "The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, I (1924), 13-28.

________. "Two Additional Notes to 'The Suffering Servant--a New Solution,'" *Vetus Testamentum*, XIII (1963), 321-332.

________. "Two Prophecies from 520-516 B.C.," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXII (1949), 365-431.

Morton, William H. "Umm el-Biyara," *Biblical Archaeologist*, XIX (1956), 26-36.

Moscati, Sabatino. *Geschichte und Kultur der Semitischen Völker*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1955.

________. *The Semites in Ancient History*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1959.

________. *Ancient Semitic Civilizations*. London: Elek Books, 1957.

Mould, Elmer W. K. *Essentials of Bible History*. Revised edition. New York: Ronald Press Company, 1951.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*. 2 vols. Translated by D. R. Ap-Thomas. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

________. *Psalmenstudien I-II*. Amsterdam: P. Schipper, 1961. [First published in 1921-24.]

Müller, W. Max. *Asien und Europa*. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engleman, 1893.

Muilenburg, James. "The Book of Isaiah, 40-66, Introduction and Exegesis," *Interpreter's Bible*. 12 vols. Edited by George Buttrick *et al*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956, V, 381-773.

Muilenburg, James. "The Book of Obadiah," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. 4 vols. Edited by George Buttrick *et al*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962, III, 678, 679.

———. "The Literary Character of Isaiah 34," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LIX (1940), 339-356.

Musil, Alois. *Arabia Deserta*. ("American Geographical Society Oriental Explorations and Studies," No. 2.) New York: American Geographical Society, 1927.

———. *Arabia Petraea*. 2 vols. Wien: Alfred Hölder, 1907.

———. *The Northern Ḥeǧâz*. ("American Geographical Society Oriental Explorations and Studies," No. 1.) New York: American Geographical Society, 1926.

Myers, Jacob M. *The Books of Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, and Jonah*. ("Layman's Bible Commentary," edited by B. H. Kelly.) Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959.

Napier, B. Davie. *Song of the Vineyard*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.

Neher, André. *L'Essence du Prophétisme*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1955.

Nielsen, Ditlef. "The Mountain Sanctuaries in Petra and Its Environs," *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, XIII (1933), 185-208.

Nöldeke, Theodor. "Edom," *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. 4 vols. Edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1901, II, cols. 1182-1188.

North, Christopher R. "The Interpretation of Deutero-Isaiah," *Interpretationes ad Vetus Testamentum*. Oslo: Land og Kirke, 1955, pp. 133-145. (Mowinckel Festschrift)

———. *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah*. London: Oxford University Press, 1948.

Noth, Martin. *Die Israelitischen Personnamen im Rahmen der Gemeinsemitischen Namengebung*. ("Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament," edited by Rudolf Kittel, Ser. III, No. 10.) Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1928.

———. *The History of Israel*. 2nd edition. Revised translation by P. R. Ackroyd. London: A. and C. Black, 1960.

Nuttall, Zelia. *The Fundamental Principles of Old and New World Civilizations*. ("Archaeological and Ethnological Papers of the Peabody Museum, Harvard University.") Cambridge: Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, 1901.

Oesterley, Wilhelm Oscar Emil. *The Psalms*. London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1953.

Oesterley, Wilhelm Oscar Emil, and Theodore H. Robinson. *A History of Israel*. 2 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932.

Palmer, E. H. *The Desert of the Exodus*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1872.

Parr, Peter J. "Excavations at Petra, 1958-59," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, XCII (1960), 124-135.

_______. "Recent Discoveries at Petra," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, LXXXIX (1957), 5-16.

Pfeiffer, Robert Henry. *The Books of the Old Testament*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1957.

_______. "Edomitic Wisdom," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XLIV (1926), 13-25.

_______. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941 and 1948.

_______. "A Non-Israelitic Source of the Book of Genesis," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, N.F. VII (1930), 66-73.

Pliny the Elder. *Caius Plinius Secundus, Natural History with an English Translation*, by H. Rackham. 9 vols. ("Loeb Classical Library.") London: W. Heinemann, 1938-52.

Pritchard, James B. (ed.). *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950.

Ptolemaei, Claudii. *Geographia*. Edidit Carolus Frideaicus Augustus Nobbe, Tom. II. Lipsiae: Caroli Tauchnitii, 1845.

Rabinowitz, Isaac. "Aramaic Inscriptions of the Fifth Century B.C.E. From a North-Arab Shrine in Egypt," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, XV (1956), 1-9.

Rad, Gerhard von. *Studies in Deuteronomy*. Translated by David Stalker. ("Studies in Biblical Theology," no. 9.) London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1953.

Redpath, Henry A. *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*. ("Westminster Commentaries," edited by Walter Lock.) London: Methuen and Company, 1907.

Reider, Joseph. *Deuteronomy*. ("The Holy Scriptures with Commentary.") Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 5708-1948.

_______. "Etymological Studies in Biblical Hebrew," *Vetus Testamentum*, IV (1954), 276-295.

Rhodes, Arnold B. *The Book of Psalms*. ("Layman's Bible Commentary," edited by B. H. Kelly.) Richmond: John Knox Press, 1960.

Robinson, Edward. "Notes on Biblical Geography," Bibliotheca Sacra, VI (1849), 366-386.

Robinson, George Livingston. The Book of Isaiah. 2nd revised edition. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1954.

_______. The Sarcophagus of an Ancient Civilization. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1930.

Robinson, H. Wheeler. The History of Israel. ("Studies in Theology," edited by Nathaniel Micklem.) London: Gerald Duckworth and Company, 1938.

_______. Two Hebrew Prophets. London: Lutterworth Press, 1948.

Robinson, Theodore H. The Book of Amos. London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1923.

_______. An Introduction to the Old Testament. London: Edward Arnold and Company, 1948.

_______. "The Structure of the Book of Obadiah," Journal of Theological Studies, XVII (1916), 402-408.

Robinson, Theodore H., and F. Horst. Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten. ("Handbuch zum Alten Testament," edited by Otto Eissfeldt.) Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1938.

Rogers, Robert William. Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament. 2nd edition. New York: Abingdon Press, 1926.

_______. A History of Ancient Persia from Its Earliest Beginnings to the Death of Alexander the Great. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929.

_______. History of Babylonia and Assyria. 2 vols. 2nd edition. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1901.

_______. The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1908.

Rothenberg, Beno. "Ancient Copper Industries in the Western Arabah," Palestine Exploration Quarterly, XCIV (1962), 5-71.

_______. God's Wilderness. Translated by Joseph Witriol. London: Thames and Hudson, 1961.

Rowley, Harold Henry. The Biblical Doctrine of Election. London: Lutterworth Press, 1950.

_______. "The Book of Ezekiel in Modern Study," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXXVI (1953), 146-190.

_______. From Joseph to Joshua. (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy for 1948.) London: The British Academy, 1950.

Rowley, Harold Henry. *The Growth of the Old Testament*. ("Hutchinson's University Library, Christian Religion," edited by E. O. James.) London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1950.

_______. "Nehemiah's Mission," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, XXXVII (1955), 528-561.

_______. *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1952.

Rudolph, Wilhelm. *Jeremia*. ("Handbuch zum Alten Testament," edited by Otto Eissfeldt.) Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1958.

_______. "Obadja," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XLIX (1931), 222-231.

Savignac, J. de. "Note sur le Sens du Terme *SÂPHÔN* dans Quelque Passages de la Bible," *Vetus Testamentum*, III (1953), 95, 96.

Sayce, A. H. "Edom, Edomites," *A Dictionary of the Bible*. 4 vols. Edited by James Hastings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902, I, 644-646.

Schmidt, Werner. *Königtum Gottes in Ugarit und Israel*. ("Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft," edited by Georg Fohrer.) Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1961.

Schumpp, P. Meinrad. *Das Buch der Zwölf Propheten*. ("Die Heilige Schrift," edited by Edmund Kalt and Willibald Lauck, X/2.) Frieburg: Verlag Herder, 1950.

Scott, R.B.Y. "The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 1-39, Introduction and Exegesis," *Interpreter's Bible*. 12 vols. Edited by George Buttrick *et al*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956, V, 151-381.

_______. *The Relevance of the Prophets*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953.

Seeligmann, I. L. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah; A Discussion of Its Problems*. ("Mededelingen en Verhandelingen." No. 9.) Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1948.

Sellin, Ernst. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. 9th edition. Revised by Leonhard Rost. Heidelberg: Quelle and Meyer, 1959.

_______. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Translated by W. Montgomery. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1923.

Simons, Jan Josef. *The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament*. ("Studia Francisci Scholten Memoriae Dicata," edited by A. A. Kampman, vol. 2.) Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959.

_______. *Jerusalem in the Old Testament*. ("Studia Francisci Scholten Memoriae Dicata," edited by A. A. Kampman, vol. 1.) Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1952.

Skinner, John. *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah*. 2 vols. Revised edition. ("Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges," edited by A. F. Kirkpatrick.) Cambridge: The University Press, vol. I, 1915; vol. II, 1917.

________. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Genesis*. ("International Critical Commentary," edited by C. A. Briggs, S. R. Driver, and Alfred Plummer.) Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1910.

________. *Prophecy and Religion*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1940.

Slotki, I. W. *Chronicles*. ("Soncino Books of the Bible," edited by A. Cohen.) London: The Soncino Press, 1952.

________. *Isaiah*. ("Soncino Books of the Bible," edited by A. Cohen.) London: The Soncino Press, 1949.

________. *Kings*. ("Soncino Books of the Bible," edited by A. Cohen.) London: The Soncino Press, 1950.

Smith, George Adam. *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*. 2 vols. 10th edition. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1903.

________. *Jeremiah*. 4th edition. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1929.

________. "The Land of Edom," *The Expositor*, VI (1908), 325-336.

Smith, John Merlin Powis. "The Chosen People," *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, XLV (1928-29), 73-82.

________. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Malachi*. ("International Critical Commentary," edited by C. A. Briggs, S. R. Driver, and Alfred Plummer.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912.

________. *The Prophets and Their Times*. 2nd edition revised by William A. Irwin. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941.

Smith, William Robertson. *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*. 3rd edition with introduction and notes by S. A. Cook. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

Snaith, Norman H. *Amos*. 2 parts. ("Study Notes on the Bible.") London: The Epworth Press, 1946.

________. "The Historical Books," *The Old Testament and Modern Study*. Edited by H. H. Rowley. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951, pp. 84-114.

________. *Hymns of the Temple*. London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1951.

Speiser, E. A. "Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millennium B.C.," *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, XIII (1931-32), 13-54.

Stinespring, William Franklin. "Review of Norman Gottwald, *Studies in Lamentations*," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXV (1956), 86.

Strabo. *The Geography of Strabo, with an English Translation by Horace Leonard Jones*. 8 vols. ("Loeb Classical Library.") London: W. Heinemann, 1917-1932.

Streane, A. W. *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Together with Lamentations*. ("Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges," edited by A. F. Kirkpatrick.) Cambridge: The University Press, 1913.

Strickland, William Claudius. "The Meaning of the Name of God in Biblical Theology." Unpublished Th.D. thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1953.

Thiele, Edwin R. "New Evidence on the Chronology of the Last Kings of Judah," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, CXLIII (1956), 22-27.

Thomas, D. Winton (ed.). *Documents from Old Testament Times*. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1958.

Thompson, John A. "The Book of Joel, Introduction and Exegesis," *Interpreter's Bible*. 12 vols. Edited by George Buttrick *et al*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956, VI, 729-760.

________. "The Book of Obadiah, Introduction and Exegesis," *Interpreter's Bible*. 12 vols. Edited by George Buttrick *et al*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956, VI, 857-867.

Thompson, R. Campbell. *The Prisms of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal*. London: The British Museum, 1931.

Torrey, Charles Cutler. "The Edomites in Southern Judah," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XVII (1898), 16-20.

________. "On the Ostraca From Elath," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, LXXXII (1941), 15, 16.

________. *Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy*. ("Yale Oriental Series, Researches," vol. XVIII.) New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930.

________. *The Second Isaiah, A New Interpretation*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1928.

Toynbee, Arnold J. *A Study of History*. 12 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1934-1961.

Treves, Marco. "The Date of Joel," *Vetus Testamentum*, VII (1957), 149-156.

Trinquet, J. *Habaquq, Abdias, Joël*. ("La Sainte Bible," edited by M. Delcor and E. Osty.) Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1953.

Trumbull, H. Clay. *Kadesh-Barnea*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884.

Van Beek, G. W., and A. Jamme. "An Inscribed South Arabian Clay Stamp from Bethel," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, CLI (1958), 9-16.

Van Zyl, A. H. *The Moabites*. ("Pretoria Oriental Series," vol. III, edited by A. Van Selms.) Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960.

Vaux, Roland de. *Ancient Israel, Its Life and Institutions*. Translated by John McHugh. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.

———. "Les Patriarches Hébreux et les Découvertes Modernes," *Revue Biblique*, LIII (1946), 321-348; LV (1948), 321-347; LVI (1949), 5-36.

Vriezen, Th. C. *An Outline of Old Testament Theology*. Translated by S. Neuijen. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958.

Wade, G. W. *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah*. ("Westminster Commentaries," edited by Walter Lock.) London: Methuen and Company, 1911.

———. *The Books of the Prophets Micah, Obadiah, Joel, and Jonah*. ("Westminster Commentaries," edited by Walter Lock.) London: Methuen and Company, 1925.

Waterman, Leroy. "The Authentication of Conjectural Glosses," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LVI (1937), 253-259.

———. "Jacob the Forgotten Supplanter," *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, LV (1938), 25-43.

———. "Some Determining Factors in the Northward Progress of Levi," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, LVII (1937), 375-380.

Weiser, Artur. *Das Buch des Propheten Jeremia*. ("Das Alte Testament Deutsch," edited by V. Herntrich and A. Weiser.) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1955.

———. *Das Buch der Zwölf Kleinen Propheten, I, Die Propheten Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obdjah, Jona, Micha*. ("Das Alte Testament Deutsch," edited by V. Herntrich and A. Weiser.) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949.

———. *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development*. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton from the 4th (1957) German edition. New York: Association Press, 1961.

———. *The Psalms*. Translated by Herbert Hartwell. ("The Old Testament Library.") Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962.

Welch, Adam Cleghorn. *Deuteronomy, the Framework to the Code*. London: Oxford University Press, 1932.

———. *Jeremiah, His Time and His Work*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1951.

Widengren, Geo. *Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets*. ("Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift," 1948:10.) Uppsala: A. B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1948.

Wigram, W. A. *The Assyrians and Their Neighbors*. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1929.

Winckler, Hugo. *The History of Babylonia and Assyria*. Translated by James Alexander Craig. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1907.

Wiseman, D. J. *Chronicles of the Chaldaean Kings (626-556 B.C.) in the British Museum*. London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1956.

Wolfe, Rolland Emerson. "The Editing of the Book of the Twelve," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LIII (1935), 90-129.

Wood, W. Carleton. "The Religion of Canaan," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XXXV (1916), 1-279.

Wright, George Ernest. "The Archaeology of Palestine," *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by G. E. Wright. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1961, pp. 73-112.

________. *Biblical Archaeology*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957.

________. "The Book of Deuteronomy, Introduction and Exegesis," *Interpreter's Bible*. 12 vols. Edited by George Buttrick *et al*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1955, II, 311-537.

________. "Iron in Israel," *Biblical Archaeologist*, I (1938), 5-8.

________. "Qosanal, Servant of the King," *Biblical Archaeologist*, I (1938), 16.

________. "Troglodytes and Giants in Palestine," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LVII (1938), 305-309.

________ and Floyd Vivian Filson. *The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible*. Revised edition. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956.

Yadin, Yigael. *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness*. Translated by Batya and Chaim Rabin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Zeuner, E. F., with Diana Kirkbride and Barry C. Park. "Stone Age Explorations in Jordan, I," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, LXXXIX (1957), 17-54.

ADDENDUM

ADDENDUM

A LISTING OF WORKS BY JULIAN MORGENSTERN

Morgenstern, Julian. "Addenda to 'The Book of the Covenant, Part III--The *Huqqim*,'" *Hebrew Union College Annual*, VII-IX (1931-32), 741-746.

________. "Additional Notes on 'The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel,'" *Hebrew Union College Annual*, III (1926), 77-107.

________. "Amos Studies I," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XI (1936), 19-140.

________. "Amos Studies II--The Sin of Uzziah, The Festival of Jeroboam, and the Date of Amos," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XII-XIII (1937-38), 1-53.

________. "Amos Studies III, The Historical Antecedents of Amos," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XV (1940), 59-304.

________. "Amos Studies, Part IV," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXXII (1961), 295-350.

________. "The Ark, the Ephod, and the Tent of Meeting, Part I," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XVII (1942-43), 153-266.

________. "The Ark, the Ephod, and the Tent of Meeting, Part II," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XVIII (1944), 1-52.

________. *As a Mighty Stream, the Progress of Judaism Through History*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1949.

________. "*Beena* Marriage (Matriarchat) in Ancient Israel and Its Historical Implications," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, N.F. VI (1929), 91-110.

________. "Biblical Theophanies," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, XXV (1911), 139-193; XXVIII (1913), 16-60.

________. "The Book of the Covenant," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, V (1928), 1-151.

________. "The Book of the Covenant, Part II," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, VII (1930), 19-258.

________. "The Book of the Covenant, Part III--the *Huqqim*," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, VIII-IX (1931-32), 1-150.

Morgenstern, Julian. "The Book of the Covenant, Part IV," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXXIII (1962), 59-105.

________. "The Chanukkah Festival and the Calendar of Ancient Israel," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XX (1947), 1-136; XXI (1948), 365-496.

________. "A Chapter in the History of the High-priesthood," *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, LV (1938), 1-24, 183-197, 360-377.

________. "Chronological Data of the Dynasty of Omri," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LIX (1940), 385-396.

________. "The Dates of Ezra and Nehemiah," *Journal of Semitic Studies*, VII (1962), 1-11.

________. "David and Jonathan," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXVIII (1959), 322-325.

________. "The Decalogue of the Holiness Code," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXVI (1955), 1-27.

________. "The Despoiling of the Egyptians," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXVIII (1949), 1-28.

________. "Deutero-Isaiah's Terminology for 'Universal God,'" *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXII (1943), 269-280.

________. "The Divine Triad in Biblical Mythology," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXIV (1945), 15-37.

________. *The Doctrine of Sin in the Babylonian Religion*. Berlin: Wolf Peiser, n.d. (Morgenstern's Doctoral dissertation, University of Heidelberg, 1904.)

________. "The Elohist Narrative in Exodus 3.1-15," *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, XXXVII (1921), 242-262.

________. *The Fire Upon the Altar*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1963.

________. "The Foundations of Israel's History," an Address to the Central Conference of American Rabbis, published in 1915. *N.V.*

________. "The Gates of Righteousness," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, VI (1929), 1-37.

________. "Genesis 14," *Studies in Jewish Literature*. Studies in honor of Prof. Kaufmann Köhler. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1913, pp. 223-236.

________. "Isaiah 40.10-13," *To Do and to Teach: Essays in Honor of Charles Pyatt*. Edited by R. M. Pierson. Lexington: College of the Bible, 1953, pp. 27-38.

________. "Isaiah 63.7-14," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXIII (1950-51), 185-203.

Morgenstern, Julian. "Jerusalem--485 B.C.," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXVII (1956), 101-179; XXVIII (1957), 15-47; XXXI (1960), 1-29.

________. *A Jewish Interpretation of the Book of Genesis*. Cincinnati: The Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1919.

________. "Kadesh-Naphtali and Ta'anach," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, N.S. IX (1919), 359-369.

________. "The King-God Among the Western Semites and the Meaning of Epiphanes," *Vetus Testamentum*, X (1960), 138-197.

________. "On Leviticus 10.3," *Paul Haupt Anniversary Volume*, 1926, pp. 97-102. *N.V.*

________. "The Loss of Words at the Ends of Line in Manuscripts of Hebrew Poetry," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXV (1954), 41-83.

________. "The Message of Deutero-Isaiah in Its Sequential Unfolding," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXIX (1958), 1-67; XXX (1959), 1-102.

________. "Moses with the Shining Face," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, II (1925), 1-27.

________. "The Mythological Background of Psalm 82," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XIV (1939), 29-126.

________. *Nation, People, Religion: What Are We*. 1943. *N.V.*

________. "The New Year for Kings," *Gaster Anniversary Volume*, pp. 439-456. *N.V.*

________. "A Note on Genesis 5:29," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XLIX (1930), 306-309.

________. "נשקו בר," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, N.S. XXXII (1942), 371-385.

________. "The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, IV (1927), 1-138.

________. "On the Gilgameš-Epic XI, 274-320: A Contribution to the Study of the Role of the Serpent in Semitic Mythology," *Revue d'Assyriologie*, (1919), 189 ff. *N.V.*

________. "The Origin of the Synagogue," *Studi Orientalistici in Onore di Giorgio Levi della Vida*. 1956, II, 192-201. *N.V.*

________. "Psalms 8 and 19A," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XIX (1945-46), 491-523.

________. "Psalm 11," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXIX (1950), 221-231.

________. "Psalm 23," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXV (1946), 13-35.

Morgenstern, Julian. "Psalm 48," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XVI (1941), 1-95.

________. "Psalm 121," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LVIII (1939), 311-323.

________. "The Rest of the Nations," *Journal of Semitic Studies*, II (1957), 225-231.

________. "The Son of Man in Daniel 7:13 f.," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXX (1961), 65-77.

________. "The Sources of the Creation Story--Gen. 1.1-2.4," *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, XXXIV (1920), 169-212.

________. "The Suffering Servant--A New Solution," *Vetus Testamentum*, XI (1961), 292-320.

________. "Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, X (1935), 1-148.

________. "The Tent of Meeting," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, XXXVIII (1918), 125-139.

________. "The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, I (1924), 13-28.

________. "Trial by Ordeal Among the Semites and in Ancient Israel," *Hebrew Union College Jubilee Volume*, 1925, pp. 113-144.

________. "Two Additional Notes to 'The Suffering Servant--a New Solution,'" *Vetus Testamentum*, XIII (1963), 321-332.

________. "Two Ancient Israelite Agricultural Festivals," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, N.S. VIII (1917), 31-54.

________. "Two Compound Technical Terms in Biblical Hebrew," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XLIII (1924), 311-320.

________. "Two Prophecies from 520-516 B.C.," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXII (1949), 365-431.

________. "Two Prophecies from the Fourth Century B.C. and the Evolution of Yom Kippur," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXIV (1952-53), 1-74.

________. "The Universality of Amos," *Essays Presented to Leo Baeck on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*. 1954. *N.V.*

BIOGRAPHY

Bruce Collins Cresson was born October 27, 1930, in Lenoir, North Carolina, the son of David C. and Cora G. Cresson. He was educated in the Lenoir City Schools, being graduated from Lenoir High School in 1948. His education was continued at Wake Forest College, from which he received the B.A. degree, Magna Cum Laude, in 1952. During his Junior year at Wake Forest College he was elected to membership in Phi Beta Kappa. Seminary training was begun in 1952 at the Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, N.C., from which he received the degrees of B.D. in 1955 and Th.M. in 1956. During the year 1955-56 he was a Fellow in Old Testament Interpretation at the Seminary.

In 1954 he was ordained to the Ministry by College Avenue Baptist Church, Lenoir, North Carolina. He served the First Baptist Church, Hillsboro, North Carolina, as Assistant Pastor, 1954-57, and as Pastor, 1957-61.

On August 7, 1955, he was married to Betty Joanne Suddreth. To this couple one child, Joanna Lynn, was born, on September 4, 1958.

He entered the Graduate School of Duke University in 1959. For the academic year of 1960-61 he held a Graduate Scholarship, and for the year of 1961-62 he held a Rockefeller Doctoral Fellowship.

Appointments as part-time Instructor of Old Testament were held at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary for the years 1957-58 and 1958-59. For the spring and fall terms of 1961 he served as part-time Instructor in the Department of Religion of Duke University. For the year 1962-63 he was

Instructor of Old Testament at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. He has accepted an appointment as Instructor in the Department of Religion of Duke University for the 1963-64 academic year.